

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from *al-Kamil* *fi'l-Ta'rikh*. Part 2



The Years
541–589/1146–1193:
The Age of Nur al-Din
and Saladin

An Ashgate Book

Translated by D.S. Richards



CRUSADE
—
TEXTS IN
—
TRANSLATION

CRUSADE TEXTS IN TRANSLATION

About the volume:

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir (1160–1233 AD), entitled *al-Kāmil fi'l-ta'rīkh*, is one of the outstanding sources for the history of the mediaeval world. It covers the whole sweep of Islamic history almost up to the death of its author and, with the sources available to him, he attempted to embrace the widest geographical spread; events in Iraq, Iran and further East run in counterpoint with those involving North Africa and Spain. From the time of the arrival of the Crusaders in the Levant, their activities and the Muslim response become the focus of the work.

While continuing with the aim of comprehensive coverage, the years in this part are dominated by the careers of Nur al-Din and Saladin, the champions of the Jihad, sometimes called the “counter-crusade”. Of special interest is the historian’s partiality for the House of the former and his perceived hostility to Saladin.

About the series:

The crusading movement bequeathed to its future historians a legacy of sources unrivalled in their range and variety. *Crusade Texts in Translation* presents these sources document in fascinating detail as well as the motivations and viewpoints, military efforts and spiritual lives, of the participants in the crusades. They narrate the internal histories of the states and societies which crusaders established or supported in the many regions where they fought. Some sources have been translated in the past but the vast majority have been available only in their original language. *Crusade Texts in Translation* provides a wide ranging corpus of texts, most of them translated for the first time, which illuminate the history of the crusades and the crusader-states from every angle, including that of their principal adversaries, the Muslim powers of the Middle East.

About the author:

D.S. Richards retired as Lecturer in Arabic at the Oriental Institute, Oxford, in 2000. He is an Emeritus Fellow of St Cross College, University of Oxford, UK.

Crusade Texts in Translation

Editorial Board

Malcolm Barber (Reading), Peter Edbury (Cardiff),
Bernard Hamilton (Nottingham), Noran Housley (Leicester),
Peter Jackson (Keele)

Titles in the series include:

Colin Imber
The Crusade of Varna, 1443–45

Carol Sweetenham
Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade
Historia Iherosolimitana

Thomas A. Fudge
The Crusade against Heretics in Bohemia, 1418–1437
Sources and Documents for the Hussite Crusades

Helen J. Nicholson
The Chronicle of the Third Crusade
Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi

Bernard S. Bachrach and David S. Bachrach
The *Gesta Tancredi* of Ralph of Caen
A History of the Normans on the First Crusade

D.S. Richards
The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for The Crusading Period from *al-Kāmil fī'l-Ta'rīkh*. Part 1
The Years 491–541/1097–1146: The Coming of the Franks and the
Muslim Response

Janet Shirley
The Song of the Cathar Wars
A History of the Albigensian Crusade

Damian Smith and Helena Buffery
The Book of Deeds of James I of Aragon
A Translation of the Medieval Catalan *Llibre dels Fets*

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr
for the Crusading Period

from

al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh

The Chronicle
of Ibn al-Athīr
for
the Crusading Period
from
al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh

Part 2

The Years 541–589/1146–1193
The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin

Translated by

D.S. Richards



First published 2007 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2007 D.S. Richards

D.S. Richards has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the translator of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Ibn al-Athir, Izz al-Din, 1160–1233

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athir for the Crusading Period from al-Kamil i'l-Ta'rikh
Part 2: The Years 541–589/1146–1193: The Age of Nur al-Din and Saladin. –
(Crusade Texts in Translation; 15)
1. Crusades – Early works to 1800. I. Title II. Richards, D. S. (Donald Sidney),
1935–.
940.1'82

Library of Congress Control Number: 2006926785

ISBN 9780754640783 (hbk)

ISBN 9780754669517 (pbk)

Contents

Preface	vii
Introduction	1
The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr	5
The Year 541 [1146–1147]	7
The Year 542 [1147–1148]	13
The Year 543 [1148–1149]	18
The Year 544 [1149–1150]	27
The Year 545 [1150–1151]	35
The Year 546 [1151–1152]	39
The Year 547 [1152–1153]	42
The Year 548 [1153–1154]	56
The Year 549 [1154–1155]	67
The Year 550 [1155–1156]	74
The Year 551 [1156–1157]	76
The Year 552 [1157–1158]	87
The Year 553 [1158–1159]	95
The Year 554 [1159–1160]	103
The Year 555 [1160]	112
The Year 556 [1161]	120
The Year 557 [1161–1162]	132
The Year 558 [1162–1163]	138
The Year 559 [1163–1164]	144
The Year 560 [1164–1165]	156
The Year 561 [1165–1166]	161
The Year 562 [1166–1167]	163
The Year 563 [1167–1168]	168
The Year 564 [1168–1169]	171
The Year 565 [1169–1170]	183
The Year 566 [1170–1171]	190
The Year 567 [1171–1172]	196
The Year 568 [1172–1173]	203

The Year 569 [1173–1174]	217
The Year 570 [1174–1175]	229
The Year 571 [1175–1176]	241
The Year 572 [1176–1177]	249
The Year 573 [1177–1178]	253
The Year 574 [1178–1179]	260
The Year 575 [1179–1180]	264
The Year 576 [1180–1181]	270
The Year 577 [1181–1182]	276
The Year 578 [1182–1183]	281
The Year 579 [1183–1184]	291
The Year 580 [1184–1185]	299
The Year 581 [1185–1186]	304
The Year 582 [1186–1187]	313
The Year 583 [1187–1188]	318
The Year 584 [1188–1189]	344
The Year 585 [1189–1190]	360
The Year 586 [1190–1191]	372
The Year 587 [1191–1192]	384
The Year 588 [1192–1193]	396
The Year 589 [1193]	408
Bibliographical References	411
Index	419

Preface

This volume comprises the second part of a planned three-volume translation of the later parts of *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh*, Ibn al-Athīr's major chronicle of Islamic history. The first part of the translation contained the period from the year 491/1097 up to 541/1146. Since these volumes appear in the series Crusader Texts in Translation, it is only reasonable that the divisions imposed on the material should refer to dates that have a relevance for the history of the Crusades. Thus the first part began with the year in which the chronicle first refers to the coming Frankish expedition to the Levant. It ended with the murder of Emir Zankī, the Atabeg of Mosul and Aleppo, whose career marked the end of one stage of the Muslim response to the Crusades.

This second part, which is now offered, has an even greater inner consistency from the viewpoint of Crusading history as it takes a crucial span of years that covers the careers of Nūr al-Dīn, son of Zankī, and his one-time subordinate Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb, whom we shall throughout refer to as Saladin. That is to say that it covers the period 541–589/1146–1193. These are years that saw the growth of the spirit of Jihad, which in this case we may call a Counter-Crusade, an altogether more concentrated effort to recover the lands lost to Latin Christendom, especially Jerusalem. A leading role in this may be credited to Nūr al-Dīn whose example was followed by Saladin (with whatever reservations might be made concerning the totality of his career). It was Saladin who achieved the major victories, although he then had to face the bitter challenges of the Third Crusade.

Even though events in Syria and Palestine take up a major share of this volume and, as we have seen, define its limits, it must not in any way be forgotten that Ibn al-Athīr wished to write a work that dealt as comprehensively as possible with what he envisaged as the Islamic world. This wider narrative has other themes that proceed according to their own separate rhythms. This means that we still have many pages that concern themselves with Muslim Spain (Andalusia) and North Africa (the Maghrib and Ifrīqiya), mainly with the developing power of the Almohad dynasty. There are many other pages that look eastwards from Ibn al-Athīr's centre of gravity, towards Persia and the lands beyond the Oxus, even across the Indus into the realms of the Hindu kings. In these pages we read of the modest revival of the political power of the Abbasid caliphate, the steady decline of the Saljuq sultanate and the constant disputes of the great emirs and atabegs, the disruptive influence of Oghuz tribesmen, the more organized challenge to the Saljuqs posed first by the Qarakhanids, a Muslim Turkish dynasty, and secondly

by the Qarakhitay, the pagan Sinified dynasty of the Western Liao, and then their mutual rivalry in Central Asia, and finally the rise of the Ghurid sultanate at the expense of the later Ghaznavids and their expansion into India.

Once again I thank the editors for accommodating these translated volumes in their series on Crusader Texts and also the publishing house of Ashgate for making it possible. My warmest thanks go to my former colleagues at Oxford University's Oriental Institute, especially to Professor Geert Jan van Gelder and Dr Emilie Savage-Smith, whose assistance has been greatly appreciated. I also acknowledge with gratitude the helpful suggestions of Dr Peter Jackson who read through my typescript. As always I owe a great deal to the constant support of my wife.

Introduction

The historian, Ibn al-Athīr or, to give him his personal name, ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū’l-Hasan ‘Alī al-Jazarī, was born on 4 Jumādā I 555/13 May 1160 at Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar (the modern Cizre), north of Mosul on the River Tigris. His father Muḥammad served in the administration of the then ruling dynasty of the Zankids, a successor state of the Saljuq sultanate. His older brother, Majd al-Dīn Mubārak, also followed a career in government service for the Zankids. This background provided Ibn al-Athīr with the pro-Zankid sentiment which is a feature of his relevant historical writings and which has so often been remarked on. There is no clear evidence that he was himself a paid servant of the Zankid regime. He records that he was an ‘associate’ of the ruling house’s prominent vizier, Jamāl al-Dīn, using a rather imprecise expression, which could mean that he was a personal friend or that he was part of the vizier’s cultural circle or, indeed, that he was a member of his paid staff. It seems more likely that our author followed his scholarly and literary bent, while living on rents from family estates and perhaps benefiting from the commercial operations that the family clearly carried on. Perhaps it may be allowed to refer the reader to the introduction to the first part¹ of this translation for further details of Ibn al-Athīr’s life and his writings and for editions and translations of the latter.

This second part has followed the lines laid down in the first as far as translation and editorial practice are concerned. They shall be set out here in summary fashion. For the translation the Beirut edition published by Dār Ṣādir² remains the basic text and, to facilitate reference to the original Arabic, its pagination has been recorded in bold within square brackets. For technical reasons this original pagination has also been used for internal cross-referencing. An accurate delivery of the original text’s meaning has quite naturally been the prime aim but readability has followed hard on its heels. The passages where the text has presented problems of interpretation, not to speak of basic intelligibility (especially in the poetic excerpts), will no doubt declare themselves to the reader. Alternative readings or emendations have been explained in footnotes. Comment and identification in footnotes have been kept to what is hoped to be a moderate, yet sufficient, level. The range of the material is such that footnotes could easily proliferate and extend beyond measure. The translator can only ask indulgence for any shortcomings and, more particularly, for cases where identification proved impossible.

¹ *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (1)*.

² Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rikh*, 13 vols, Dār Ṣādir, Beirut, 1965–7.

Dates according to the Hijrī calendar have been converted into those of the Christian era according to the table given by Grenville.³ If an ‘equals’ sign (=) precedes an AD date, this signifies that the day of the month has been adjusted to achieve a congruence of the day of the week.

The question of transliteration has been treated in Part 1 and the same practice has been followed here. Among other things this means that certain toponyms and terms have been given in an anglicized form, where such exists.

The introduction to Part 1 ended with some explanatory comment on the way that certain commonly occurring terms were to be translated. Broadly speaking, the same list will apply in this present volume. One further term deserves comment. It is a military term, that is to say, *yazak*. It lacks precision, as is so often the case, and can in different circumstances imply an advanced guard, a small tactical force operating independently, or a screening or picketing force. Variations on all of these will be met with.

A question that always looms around discussion of Ibn al-Athīr’s *Kāmil* is the identification of the sources for his wide-ranging narrative – or, to be more pertinent, the problem that Ibn al-Athīr routinely fails to specify his sources. It is not the case that he neglects absolutely to name informants. In fact, he indicates a source, sometimes left as an anonymous oral source, more often than one might think, but usually for a very limited and specific item. His family, because of their connection with the Atabeg house, was a source of information for him and it may have been through them that he was able to claim that he saw a letter of Saladin in his own hand. What he fails to do is to state clearly which accounts he has relied on to give him his fundamental narrative.

It is, however, abundantly clear from even a cursory comparison of the texts that for events at Baghdad and the general milieu of caliph and sultan he relied greatly on the chronicle of Ibn al-Jawzī,⁴ which comes to an end in the year 574/1177. For the history of lands further to the east in the orbit of the Ghaznavids, the Ghurids and the Qarakhitay Ibn al-Athīr’s sources are far from obvious. In one passage he names Ibn Funduq,⁵ but unfortunately in connection with events that date from after Ibn Funduq’s death. One assumes therefore that what Ibn al-Athīr had access to at this point was in fact a continuation, by an unspecified hand, of Ibn Funduq’s work. This does not in any way rule out the decided probability that Ibn al-Athīr used Ibn Funduq’s own writings for earlier matters. These particular later events are further set out in the *Kāmil* in a different version which is anonymous and which Ibn al-Athīr is unable to reconcile with the so-called Ibn Funduq account. In short, the historiography of this period and this area is limited and would have been even more limited for Ibn al-Athīr, if one accepts that he was

³ See G. S. P. Grenville, *The Muslim and Christian Calendars being tables for the conversion of Muslim and Christian dates from the Hijra to the year A.D. 2000*, Oxford, 1963.

⁴ As a source Ibn al-Jawzī is expressly mentioned s.a. 569 p. [410].

⁵ See s.a. 568 p. [386].

unable to consult Persian works. Bosworth has made a useful survey of the historical writings from the eastern Iranian world.⁶

If one moves to the western Islamic world, the question of Ibn al-Athīr's sources has not, to my knowledge, been systematically investigated. However for events in Ifrīqiya (modern Tunisia) one can be fairly certain that Ibn al-Athīr used the history of Emir ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Shaddād, a member of the Zīrid house, who after its fall moved to Syria and entered Saladin's service. Ibn al-Athīr refers directly to his history only once and that for an earlier period.⁷ However, Ibn Shaddād's account of the depredations inflicted upon Ifrīqiya by the Almoravid from Majorca, ‘Alī ibn Ishāq, has much in common with *Kāmil*'s account under the year 581/1185–6.⁸ There is also a significant resemblance between *Kāmil*'s account of the Almohad capture of Tunis and Mahdiyya, given under the year 554/1159, and that attributed to Ibn Shaddād.⁹

For the events in Syria and Palestine the question of Ibn al-Athīr's sources is not such a problem, because we possess enough of the historical writings of Ibn al-Qalānisī and ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī to show that they were the ones mainly utilized by Ibn al-Athīr.¹⁰ Ibn al-Qalānisī's work on the history of Damascus,¹¹ his *Dhayl* (Continuation), ends at 555/1160, the year of the author's own death. ‘Imād al-Dīn was the author of two important histories. One survives in full, namely *al-Fath al-quṣṣī*, a history of Saladin's career from 583/1187, the year of the battle of Ḥaṭṭīn, until the year of his death. The other, *al-Barq al-shāmī* (Syrian Lightning), which traces the author's own career alongside those of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin, is extant only in two parts, covering the years 573–5/1177–9 and 578–80/1182–4. However the thirteenth-century historian al-Bundārī made an abbreviated version of it, which he entitled *Sanā al-barq al-shāmī*, and another thirteenth-century historian Abū Shāma incorporated much of ‘Imād al-Dīn's writings (and incidentally also Ibn al-Athīr's) in his *Kitāb al-Rawdatayn* (the Book of the Two Gardens) on the reigns of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin.

The study of Arabic historiography of the Crusades and the position of Ibn al-Athīr owes much to H.A.R. Gibb, who tried to establish not only the sources Ibn al-Athīr used but also how faithfully and accurately he had used them.¹² He gave

⁶ Bosworth, ‘Arabic, Persian and Turkish historiography’.

⁷ See *Kāmil*, viii, 27.

⁸ Ibn Shaddād's work, which is not directly extant, is quoted by an early fourteenth-century traveller (Tijānī, *Rihla*, 14).

⁹ Quoted in Tijānī, *Rihla*, 346–8.

¹⁰ Ibn al-Qalānisī is in fact expressly quoted s.a. 523 p. [560] and ‘Imād al-Dīn s.a. 586 p. [56].

¹¹ Ibn ‘Asākir (died 571/1176) is another historian of Damascus, whose work is quoted by Ibn al-Athīr s.a. 543 p. [131].

¹² H.A.R. Gibb, ‘Notes on the Arabic Materials for the History of the Early Crusades,’ *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. vii, 1935, 739–54; idem, ‘The Arabic sources for the Life of Saladin’, *Speculum*, xxv, 58–72.

an unfavourable verdict and attributed the shortcomings in Ibn al-Athīr's use of his sources to his pro-Zankid and anti-Saladin sentiments. There is a difficulty in establishing beyond any doubt that the rearrangement of material and the inaccuracies that Gibb identified were really intentional and motivated in this way and that they were not the result of editorial confusion. The historian's attitude to Saladin is complex and far from being wholly negative. There are indeed passages where Saladin is criticized but these can be balanced by passages where admiration is expressed. When explicit blame is attached, for instance over Saladin's notorious failure to deal with Tyre to prevent its becoming a future threat, we know that Ibn al-Athīr was benefiting from a large dose of hindsight but nevertheless in Ibn al-Athīr's account there is also some implicit excusing of Saladin in the recognition that Saladin was limited by the means and institutions that he was working with.

Abū Shāma portrayed Nūr al-Dīn as the first genuine proponent of the Jihad against the Frankish invaders, whose religiously inspired action marked a significant change in the depth of dedication and commitment to the struggle. In Abū Shāma's view Saladin followed in the footsteps of Nūr al-Dīn and in due course, as the model *mujāhid*, outstripped his achievements by his own victories and the reconquest of Jerusalem. This view rather puts on one side the events of the Third Crusade and the disappointing end to Saladin's career, the military stalemate and the growing exhaustion and discontent of the Muslim armies.

Ibn al-Athīr's narrative in this part certainly supports the idea of Nūr al-Dīn as a model Islamic ruler and exponent of the Jihad. This is hardly surprising owing to Ibn al-Athīr's close family ties with the Atabeg dynasty. His pious gratitude is amply revealed in his monograph dedicated to the dynasty, *al-Ta'rikh al-bāhir*. On the other hand his portrayal of Saladin is mixed, as has been said. There are indications that he saw him as a usurper, motivated by his dynastic ambitions, but the picture is not wholly bad and the final judgment is generous.

The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr

The Age of Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin

Account of how Zankī's two sons, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī and Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, took power

After Atabeg Zankī was killed,¹ Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, his son, took his signet ring from his hand, for he was present with him, and set out for Aleppo which he took possession of. At that time Zankī's administration was being carried on, and authority in his state exercised, by one of the turbanned classes [113], Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī,² who monopolized the government. His associate was the Emir-Chamberlain Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yaghīsiyānī.³ They agreed to preserve the dynasty. At the Martyr Atabeg's court was the Prince Alp Arslān ibn Sultan Maḥmūd.⁴ He rode forth that day and troops gathered around him. Jamāl al-Dīn and Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn came to him and encouraged him to occupy himself with drinking, singers and slave girls. They got him to enter Raqqā, where he remained for several days, making no public appearance. He then travelled to Māksīn which he entered. He stayed there for some days, while Jamāl al-Dīn was taking oaths of support for Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, from the emirs and sending them to Mosul.

From Māksīn Alp Arslān went to Sinjār, after Sayf al-Dīn had already arrived at Mosul. After reaching Sinjār Jamāl al-Dīn sent to the governor of the citadel, telling him to send the following message to the Sultan's son: 'I am your servant but I am subject to Mosul. If and when you take it, I shall deliver Sinjār to you.' He therefore set off for Mosul but Jamāl al-Dīn seized him and took him to the town of Balad. Few of the troops remained with him. He advised him to cross the Tigris. He crossed over to the east with a small band.

Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī had been in the town of Shahrazūr, which was his fief. His father's deputy in Mosul, Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī Kūchuk,⁵ sent to summon him to Mosul, where he arrived before the Prince. When Jamāl al-Dīn learnt that Sayf al-Dīn had

¹ Zankī was killed in Rabi' II 541/September 1146. He was the eponymous founder of a dynasty, for a general account of which see *EI*(2), xi, 452-5, s.v. Zangids.

² This prominent servant of the Zankid dynasty, also known as al-Jawād al-Isfahānī (see *EI*(2), ii, 489), died in 559/1164.

³ Muḥammad ibn Ayyūb al-Yaghīsiyānī, whose other *nisha* al-‘Imādī alludes to his service with ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī, was later governor of Homs and died in Dhū'l-Qa'da 552/December 1157 (Ibn Qal., 347).

⁴ i.e. the Saljuq prince for whom Zankī acted as regent/guardian (atabeg). As Zankī met his death on campaign, he was called 'the Martyr' (*al-shahīd*).

⁵ Turkoman in origin, Abū'l-Hasan ‘Alī ibn Baktakīn was called Kuchuk (Turkish: small) because of his stature (*Wafayāt*, iv, 114).

arrived at Mosul, he sent to tell him how few were the men with the Prince, so he dispatched some of his troops, who arrested him. He was imprisoned in the citadel of Mosul. Sayf al-Dīn's control of the lands became well established, but his brother, Nūr al-Dīn, remained in Aleppo, which he held. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Yāghīsiyānī joined him to administer his affairs and to undertake to maintain his rule. We have given a complete exposition of these events in our *The Resplendent History of the Atabeg Dynasty (al-Ta'rīkh al-bāhir)*.⁶

[114] Account of the rebellion of Edessa after the death of the Atabeg

Joscelin the Frank, who had been lord of Edessa, was in his dominion, that is, Tell Bāshir and the neighbourhood. He wrote to the people of Edessa, the generality of whom were Armenians, and urged them to rebel, resist the Muslims and surrender the city. They agreed to do this and he appointed a day on which he would come to them. He proceeded to Edessa with his troops and conquered the city but the citadel and the Muslims who were within held out against him, despite his attacks on them. News of this reached Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, while he was at Aleppo. He set out with his army on forced marches. When he drew near, Joscelin departed in flight back to his own land. Nūr al-Dīn entered the city and at that time sacked it and enslaved its populace.

This was the occasion when the city was plundered and became devoid of inhabitants. Only a small number remained there. Many people think that it was plundered when the Martyr conquered it but this is not so.

The news about the rising at Edessa reached Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī. He sent troops there but they heard, while they were on the way, of Nūr al-Dīn's seizure of the city and his allowing it to be sacked, so they turned back.

A remarkable thing that is related is that Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, who was the deputy in the citadel of Mosul for the Martyr and his sons, received a present which Nūr al-Dīn sent to him from this conquest. It included a slave girl. After he had been with her and left after his ablutions, he said to those with him, 'Do you know what has happened to me on this day?' 'No,' they replied. 'When we conquered Edessa,' he continued [115], 'with the Martyr, part of the plunder that fell into my hands was a splendid girl, whose beauty delighted me. My heart inclined to her. Then all of a sudden the Martyr made a proclamation ordering the return of captives and plundered property. He was held in awe and fear, so I gave her back, although my heart was attached to her. Just now a gift from Nūr al-Dīn came to me, consisting of several girls, that girl being one of them. I have had my way with her for fear that I might have to hand her back as before.'

⁶ See *Bāhir*, 84–86. Sultan Maṣ'ūd readily recognized Sayf al-Dīn's position because of their long-standing friendship.

How ‘Abd al-Mu’min gained control of Andalusia

In this year ‘Abd al-Mu’min⁷ sent an army to Andalusia and took control of the lands of Islam there. This came about because, when ‘Abd al-Mu’min besieged Marrakech, a group of notables of Andalusia, one of whom was Abū Ja’far Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamdīn, came to him, bearing a letter that contained the submission of the people of their towns to ‘Abd al-Mu’min, their entry into the ranks of his followers, the Almohads, and their support for his cause.⁸ ‘Abd al-Mu’min accepted this with thanks and put their minds at rest. They asked him for assistance against the Franks, so he equipped a large force and sent it with them. He prepared a fleet and sent it to sea. The fleet arrived at Andalusia and they attacked the city of Seville, reaching it by its river. An army of the Veiled Ones⁹ was there. The attackers besieged it by land and by water and took it by assault. Several were killed there. The population sought terms and stayed quiet. The troops took control of the country and the people there became [subjects] of ‘Abd al-Mu’min.

[116] Account of the killing of ‘Abd al-Rahmān [ibn] Tughāyuruk and ‘Abbās, the lord of Rayy

During this year Sultan Mas‘ūd killed Emir-Chamberlain ‘Abd al-Rahmān [ibn]¹⁰ Tughāyuruk, who was the lord of Khalkhāl and part of Azerbaijan and the effective ruler of the sultan’s state. Alongside him the sultan had no authority.

The reason for his being killed was that, after ‘Abd al-Rahmān had so severely limited the sultan, he remained with him rather like a captive with no authority in the country. In the end ‘Abd al-Rahmān singled out a page who belonged to the sultan, namely Arslān Beg, known as Khāṣṣ Beg ibn Balankirī,¹¹ whom the sultan had raised and taken as an intimate, and removed him, so that the sultan could no more see him. Khāṣṣ Beg had intelligence, resourcefulness, an excellent mind and the ability to achieve what he wanted to do. When ‘Abd al-Rahmān assembled the troops, among whom was Khāṣṣ Beg, the latter and Sultan Mas‘ūd had already agreed between them that ‘Abd al-Rahmān should be killed. Khāṣṣ Beg summoned a group of men whom he trusted and discussed this with them. Each of them feared

⁷ ‘Abd al-Mu’min ibn ‘Alī, a Zanāta Berber, who succeeded the Mahdi Ibn Tumart as ruler (1130-63) of the Almohads in the Maghrib (Abun-Nasr, *Maghrib*, 106-8).

⁸ Ibn Ḥamdīn, governor of Cordoba, had along with other local rulers rebelled against the Almoravids.

⁹ *al-mulaiththamīn*, i.e. the Almoravids.

¹⁰ See *Bundārī*, index.

¹¹ A Turkoman emir whose high position under Sultan Mas‘ūd won him his soubriquet, Khāṣṣ Beg (special lord). An ‘overmighty subject’, he was executed in 548/1153. See *EI*(2), iv, 1097.

to take this step against him, except for a man called Zankī, who was a life-guard (*jāndār*). He offered on his own initiative to be the first to strike. A group of emirs conspired with Khāṣṣ Beg to support his plan. While ‘Abd al-Rahmān was parading in the retinue, Zankī the Life-Guard struck him on the head with an iron mace he had in his hand. He fell to the ground and Khāṣṣ Beg despatched him. The emirs with whom he had conspired to this end helped him to protect Zankī and his associates. His killing took place outside Ganja.

News of this came to Sultan Mas‘ūd when he was at Baghdad with Emir ‘Abbās, lord of Rayy. The latter’s troops were more numerous than the sultan’s. Although disapproving of this and vexed by it, the sultan handled him with blandishments and gentleness. He summoned Emir Alpqush Kūn Khar from al-Lihf¹² [117] and also Tatar, who was a chamberlain. Backed by these two, he called ‘Abbās to him in his palace. As he entered, his men were prevented from entering with him. They turned him aside into a chamber and said to him, ‘Take off the brigandine.’ He said, ‘I have oaths and undertakings from the sultan.’ They punched him and some mamlukes, prepared for this purpose, emerged to deal with him. Thereupon he made his confession of faith, took off his brigandine and cast it down. They struck him with their swords, then cut off his head and threw it to his followers. Later they threw out his corpse. His baggage train and his tents were plundered and this put the city in a turmoil.

‘Abbās was one of Sultan Maḥmūd’s mamlukes, of excellent conduct, just towards his peasants and a great warrior for the Faith against the Bāṭinīs, of whom he killed very many and built a beacon from their heads at Rayy. He besieged the castle of Alamut and entered one of their villages, which he set fire to and burnt everyone there, men, women and children, and all else besides. After he was killed, he was buried on the West Bank. His daughter later sent and had him carried to Rayy, where she buried him. His murder took place in Dhū'l-Qa'da [April 1147].

It was a strange coincidence that al-‘Ibādī was preaching one day when ‘Abbās attended. One of those present at the session voiced objection and dashed towards Emir ‘Abbās, whose followers beat him and restrained him, fearful for ‘Abbās because he was extremely wary of Bāṭinī attacks. He always wore a brigandine and his valiant mamlukes were ever at his side. Al-‘Ibādī said to him, ‘O Emir, how long this caution? By God, if some fate had been decreed for you, with your own hand would you loose the buttons of your brigandine, for your fate to be fulfilled.’ What he said came to pass.

The sultan had appointed as his vizier Ibn Dārust, the vizier of Būz-Aba, though unwillingly, as has been mentioned before. At this present time he dismissed him, as he preferred to be dismissed and to return to his master Būz-Aba. After

¹² According to Yāqūt, iv, 353, ‘a well-known district in the Baghdad area ... containing several strong castles.’ Bandanījīn was in the Lihf district, ‘the Foot-hills’ of the Kurdistan Mountains (Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 63).

dismissing him, he arranged with him to bring about Būz-Aba's reconciliation with him and remove any apprehension he might have by reason of the killing of 'Abd al-Rahmān and 'Abbās. The vizier departed, hardly believing his escape, and came to Būz-Aba. What happened we shall relate later.

[118] Miscellaneous events

During this year Sultan Mas'ūd imprisoned his brother, Sulaymān Shāh, in the citadel of Takrit.¹³

This year Emir Jāwulī al-Tughrilī, lord of Arrāniyya and part of Azerbayjan, died. He had made moves towards rebellion. His death was sudden; when stringing a bow, he suffered a haemorrhage and died.¹⁴

The Chief Shaykh Şadr al-Dīn Ismā'il ibn Abī Sa'd al-Şūfī died at Baghdad and was buried outside the Zawzanī Hospice at the Basra Gate. He was born in the year 464 [1071-2].¹⁵ His son, Şadr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahīm took his post as chief shaykh.

There died this year the Chief Syndic Muhammād ibn Tīrād al-Zaynabī, the brother of Sharaf al-Dīn, the vizier.¹⁶

This year Mas'ūd ibn Bilāl was appointed to the post of prefect of Baghdad and the sultan left the city.

In Iraq there was a plague of locusts which ruined the crops of most of the country.

This year al-'Ibādī, the preacher, arrived as an ambassador of Sultan Sanjar to the caliph. He gave sermons at Baghdad and was very well received there. Sultan Mas'ūd and lesser persons attended his sessions. The common people neglected their occupations to attend his sessions and get as close to him as possible.¹⁷

After the killing of the Martyr Zankī ibn Āqsunqur this year, the lord of Damascus attacked the castle of Baalbek and put it under siege. Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb ibn Shādhī¹⁸ was there acting as the governor. He feared that Zankī's sons would not be able to send him help in time, so he made terms and surrendered the citadel, receiving a fief and a sum of money. Ayyūb was also given ownership of several villages in Damascus territory. He moved to Damascus and took up permanent residence there.

¹³ Or in the citadel of Sarjahān in the Daylam mountains (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 221). See Krawulsky, 308-9, s.v. Sar-i Jahān, 5 leagues east of Sultaniyya.

¹⁴ Jāwulī and the Emirs Būz-Aba and 'Abbās had formed an alliance against Sultan Mas'ūd but failed to cooperate effectively. Jāwulī died at Zanjan in Jumādā I/9 October-7 November 1146 (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 221-22).

¹⁵ According to *Muntazam*, x, 121, he was born in 465/1072-3. He died in Jumādā I/October-November 1146.

¹⁶ Born in 462/1069-70, died 23 Sha'bān/28 January 1147 (*Muntazam*, x, 123).

¹⁷ The final phrase is a speculative translation of *wa'l-musābaqa ilayhi*.

¹⁸ i.e. Saladin's father.

In Rabī‘ II of this year [September 1146] ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad, Abū Muḥammad al-Muqrī, the grandson of Shaykh Abū Manṣūr, died. He was born in Sha‘bān of the year 464 [May 1072]. He was a teacher of the Koran (*muqrī*), a grammarian and a scholar of Ḥadīth and also the author of several works on the Koran recensions.¹⁹

¹⁹ He died Monday 18 Rabī‘ II/=30 September 1146. Ibn al-Jawzī studied Koran and Ḥadīth under him and writes of him with affection and respect (*Muntaẓam*, x, 122).

Account of the killing of Būz-Aba

When the killing of ‘Abbās reached the ears of Emir Būz-Aba, he gathered his troops from Fars and Khūzistān and marched to Isfahan, which he put under siege. He sent a second force to Hamadhan and a third to the fortress of Māhkī, in the territory of al-Lihf. As for his troops in Māhkī, Emir Alpqush Kūn Khar marched against them and drove them out of those regions, which were his fief. Then Būz-Aba moved away from Isfahan, seeking Sultan Mas‘ūd. The sultan made overtures to him about peace but he did not respond to them. He made a forced march and the two met in pitched battle at Qarātakīn’s Meadow.¹ After both armies had engaged, the right and the left wings of Sultan Mas‘ūd were routed. Both centres fought very fiercely and strongly and both sides held firm. The battle continued between them and then Būz-Aba fell from his horse, hit by an arrow. Another account says, no, his horse fell and brought him down. He was made prisoner, taken to the sultan and put to death before him. After he had been taken prisoner his followers fled the field.

The rout of the right and left wings of the sultan’s army took them as far as Hamadhan. Large numbers were slain from both sides. This battle was one of the greatest that took place between the ‘Ajāmīs.²

[120] How the people of Gabès submitted to the Franks and how the Muslims then conquered it

Before this year the lord of the city of Gabès was a man called Rushayd.³ He died and left some sons. A freedman of his, whose name was Yūsuf, turned to the youngest son, called Muḥammad, and made him ruler, expelling the oldest son, called Mu‘ammār. Yūsuf took charge of the city and exercised authority over Muḥammad because of his young age.

Certain incidents, molestation of his [former] master’s womenfolk, occurred. The responsibility for this report rests on its source. One of the women was a

¹ For this location ('a day's march from Hamadhan' according to *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 225), the site of many battles, see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), [331].

² ‘Ajāmī (plural: *A‘ājim*) denotes a non-Arab, here Turks or more generally a person from the eastern lands of Islam.

³ For the events of this section, see Idris, *La Berbérie*, 353-5. For the spelling Rushayd (rather than Rashīd), see op. cit., 353, note 277. Ma‘mar is a possibility, rather than Mu‘ammār.

woman of the Banū Qurra. She sent to her brothers complaining of her situation. When her brothers came to take her, Yūsuf stopped them and said, ‘This is the harem of my master,’ and refused to hand her over. The Banū Qurra and Mu‘ammar ibn Rushayd went to al-Ḥasan, the lord of Ifrīqiya⁴ and complained to him about what Yūsuf was doing. Al-Ḥasan wrote to him about this but Yūsuf paid no attention. He said, ‘If al-Ḥasan does not leave me alone, I shall surrender Gabès to the king of Sicily.’ Al-Ḥasan prepared an army to attack him and when Yūsuf heard of this, he sent to Roger the Frank, king of Sicily, and offered him his allegiance. He said to him, ‘I want you to give me a robe of honour and appoint me governor of Gabès to be your deputy, just as you did with the Banū Maṭrūḥ in Tripoli.’ Roger sent him robes and a diploma. He donned the vestments and the diploma was read at an assembly of the leading men.

Thereupon al-Ḥasan exerted himself to equip his troops to go to Gabès. They set out and put it under siege. The citizens rose against Yūsuf because of his policy of submitting to the Franks and they delivered the town to al-Ḥasan’s army. Yūsuf fortified himself in the citadel but they assailed it until they overcame it. Yūsuf was taken prisoner. Mu‘ammar ibn Rashīd and the Banū Qurra set about torturing him. They cut off his penis and inserted it into his mouth. He was subjected to a variety of tortures.

Mu‘ammar became ruler of Gabès in place of his brother Muḥammad and the Banū Qurra took away their sister. Ḥasan, the brother of Yūsuf, and Yūsuf’s son fled and made their way to Roger, king of Sicily. They sought protection [121] with him and complained of their treatment from al-Ḥasan. This made Roger angry and the sequel, the conquest of al-Mahdiyya, we shall mention under the year 543 [1148–9], God willing.

Account of an incident, the like of which any wise man ought to be wary of

This same Yūsuf, lord of Gabès, had sent an envoy to Roger in Sicily. He and the envoy of al-Ḥasan, lord of al-Mahdiyya, met before Roger and a dispute occurred between the two envoys. Yūsuf’s envoy spoke of al-Ḥasan and the trouble he had caused and blamed his conduct. They both returned at the same time, each one sailing in his own ship. Al-Ḥasan’s envoy wrote a report to his master by pigeon post, telling him of Yūsuf’s envoy’s behaviour. Al-Ḥasan sent some of his men to sea, who captured Yūsuf’s envoy and brought him before al-Ḥasan. He berated him, saying, ‘You have given the Franks control of Muslim lands and let your unbridled tongue censure me!’ He mounted him on a camel, with a pointed cap with bells on his head, and paraded him through the city. A crier proclaimed, ‘This is the reward of anyone who strives to make the Franks masters of Muslim lands.’ When he reached the centre of al-Mahdiyya, the common people rose up and stoned him to death.

⁴ i.e. al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm of the Zirid dynasty (ruled 515–43/1121–48).

How the Franks took Almeria and other places in Andalusia

In Jumādā I of this year [October 1147] the Franks besieged Almeria in Andalusia and pressed it hard by land and by sea. They took it by force of arms and carried out much killing and plundering. [122] They also conquered the city of Baeza and the province of Jaen, both in Andalusia. Then later on the Muslims recovered these places, as we shall relate, God willing.

Account of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī's taking of several places in Frankish territory

During this year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Aleppo, entered Frankish territory and took by the sword and plundered the town of Artāh, the fortress of Mābūla,⁵ Baṣarfūt⁶ and Kafarlāthā.⁷ After the murder of his father Zankī, the Franks had become ambitious and thought that, now that he was dead, they would regain what he had taken. When they saw such zeal from Nūr al-Dīn at the beginning of his reign, they realized that what they had hoped for was remote.

How al-Hilla was taken from ‘Alī ibn Dubays and then restored to him

In this year the followers of ‘Alī ibn Dubays⁸ caused considerable disturbance in al-Hilla and neighbouring places. There were many complaints about this. Sultan Mas‘ūd assigned al-Hilla to Emir Salārkurd, who set out there from Hamadhan with an army. A detachment of the troops of Baghdad was seconded to him. When they started out for al-Hilla, ‘Alī assembled and organized his forces. The two armies met at Maṭrābād and ‘Alī was defeated. Salārkurd took al-Hilla and put ‘Alī’s family under guard. The troops went home and he remained in al-Hilla with his mamlukes and followers.

‘Alī ibn Dubays went to join Alpqush Kūn Khar, who was at his fief in al-Lihf, claiming that the sultan had wronged him. When ‘Alī asked Alpqush for aid, he went with him to Wāsiṭ. He and al-Turunṭā’ī made an agreement and they all attacked al-Hilla and recovered it from Salārkurd in Dhū'l-Hijja [22 April-20 May 1148]. Salārkurd abandoned it and returned to Baghdad.

⁵ In Elisséeff, 409, with no comment: Māmūla.

⁶ Kāmil has Buṣrafūn. For Baṣarfūt, an outlying fort of Aleppo, north of al-Bāra [*EI*(2), i, 1024-5], see Le Strange, *Palestine*, 421; Elisséeff, 215, 410.

⁷ On the slopes of Jabal ‘Āmila, a day’s journey from Aleppo (Le Strange, *Palestine*, 470).

⁸ A member of the Mazyadid dynasty (see *EI*(1), vi, 965-6), whose main support came from the Arabs of the Banū Asad. ‘Alī had driven his brother Muḥammad from Ḥilla and defeated an earlier force sent from Baghdad (*Muntazam*, x, 116, s.a. 540/1145-60).

[123] Miscellaneous events

In Jumādā I [October 1147] al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh Yūsuf, son of al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh, was proclaimed in the khutbah as heir apparent.

This year ‘Awn al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra was appointed chief secretary of the Bureau of Control in Baghdad and Za‘īm al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Ja‘far was put in charge of the Storeroom.

In Rabī‘ I [August 1147] Abū'l-Qāsim Tāhir ibn Sa‘īd ibn Abī Sa‘īd ibn Abī'l-Khayr al-Mīhanī, the shaykh of the Bisṭāmī Hospice at Baghdad, died.⁹

In Rabī‘ II [September 1147] there died the Lady Fatima, daughter of Sultan Muḥammad and wife of al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh.¹⁰

In Rajab [December 1147] the death occurred of Abū'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Muslima, Ibn Ra‘īs al-Ru‘asā’. He was born in the year 484 [1091–2]. He had become a sufi and he made his residence in the palace a hospice for sufis.¹¹

This year Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī marched to the castle of Dārā, which he took, as he did other castles in the territory of Mardin. He then went to Mardin, besieged it and ruined and ravaged its land. The reason for this was that, after Atabeg Zankī was killed, the lords of Mardin and Ḥiṣn [Kayfā] presumed to claim those lands of theirs that he had conquered and they duly seized them. After Sayf al-Dīn came to the throne and gained power, he marched to Mardin, besieged it and perpetrated dreadful acts in its territory. Seeing what he was doing in the land, its lord, who was at this time Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, said, ‘We used to complain of Atabeg Zankī. Where are his days now! They were festive days. He besieged us more than once but neither he nor anyone in his army took a bag of straw without paying for it. Neither he nor his troops injured the revenue of the sultan. However, I see this man plundering and ruining the land.’

[124] Ḥusām al-Dīn later made contact and reached a settlement, arranging his daughter’s marriage to him. Sayf al-Dīn retired and returned to Mosul. Ḥusām al-Dīn prepared a retinue for his daughter and sent her to Sayf al-Dīn. When she arrived, he was ill and on the point of death. The marriage was not consummated but she remained with him until his death. Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd succeeded and took her as his wife, as we shall relate, God willing.

This year there was a famine in Ifriqiya, which lasted a long time. It had begun in the year 537 [1142–3]. It had a terrible effect on the population, who even resorted to cannibalism. Because of starvation the nomads sought out the towns and the townspeople closed the gates against them. Plague and great mortality

⁹ Died Monday 12 Rabī‘ I/11 August (*Muntaẓam*, x, 128).

¹⁰ According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 128, she died in Rabī‘ I/October 1147, at Baghdad.

¹¹ Muḥammad, the grandson of the caliph’s vizier killed by Basāsīrī in 450/1059 (see Richards, *Annals*, 121–4) died the eve of Friday 9 Rajab/=5 December 1147 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 129).

followed. The country was emptied and from whole families not a single person survived. Many people travelled to Sicily in search of food and met with great hardship.

Account of the Franks' capture of the city of al-Mahdiyya in Ifrīqiya

Under the year 541 [1146-7]¹ we have already mentioned how the family of Yūsuf, lord of Gabès, went to Roger, king of Sicily, and begged his assistance. This angered Roger, between whom and al-Hasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu’izz ibn Bādīs al-Šanhājī, ruler of Ifrīqiya, there were treaties of peace for several years. He knew that he had missed the chance to conquer the land during the present hardship which afflicted them. The hardship was the continuation of the famine throughout all the Maghrib from the year 537 [1142-3] until this present year. It was at its worst in the year 542 [1147-8]. The people abandoned their towns and villages and the majority emigrated to a city of Sicily. There were cases of cannibalism and large-scale mortality. So Roger took advantage of these hard times and built a fleet which he made very large. It amounted to about 250 galleys, full of men, weapons and supplies.

The fleet sailed from Sicily and came to the island of Pantelleria, lying between al-Mahdiyya and Sicily. They came across a ship there which had come from Mahdiyya. The crew were seized and brought before George, the commander of the fleet.² He questioned them about the state of Ifrīqiya and found on board a cage of pigeons, so he asked them whether they had dispatched any of them. They swore that they had not sent any. [126] He then ordered the man who had the pigeons with him to write in his own hand: ‘When we arrived at the island of Pantelleria, we found ships from Sicily there. We questioned them about their God-forsaken fleet and were told that it had sailed to the islands of Constantinople.’

The pigeon was released and came to Mahdiyya. Emir al-Hasan and the people were delighted. George’s plan was to arrive by surprise. He set sail and intended to reach Mahdiyya at dawn to invest it before any people left. Had he managed that not one of them would have survived. However, God Almighty decreed that He sent against them a dreadful wind which checked them. They were only able to make headway under oars and on 2 Šafar this year [22 June 1148] day broke before they arrived. The people caught sight of them and when George realized this and that his cunning plan had failed, he sent to Emir al-Hasan, saying, ‘I have come with this fleet merely to seek revenge for Muḥammad ibn Rushayd, lord of Gabès, and to restore it to him. As for you, there are treaties and a compact between us to last a while yet. We want an army from you to join us.’

¹ Actually under the year 542/1147-8; see above pp. [120-21].

² That is the Greek, George of Antioch, since 1132 the Sicilian grand admiral.

Al-Hasan gathered the leading lawyers and notables and consulted them. They said, ‘Let us fight our enemy, for our city is strong.’ He replied, ‘I fear that he will disembark and beleaguer us by land and by sea and cut us off from our supplies. We do not have enough to feed us for a month. We shall then be taken by force. I consider that to save Muslims from captivity and death is better than to continue to rule. He has demanded an army from me against Gabès. If I comply, then it is not lawful for me to aid infidels against Muslims, and if I refuse, he will say, “The peace treaty between us has been broken.” He simply wishes to distract us until he can cut us off from the land. We do not have the power to fight him. The right course is for us to leave with our wives and children and to abandon the city. Anyone who wants to act as we do, let him hurry to join us.’

[127] He ordered an immediate departure and took with him whoever presented himself and whatever was light to carry. The people left in blind panic with their wives and children and any light possessions and furnishings. There were some people who hid with the Christians and in the churches. The fleet remained at sea, held back by the wind from reaching Mahdiyya, for two-thirds of the day. Of those who planned to leave not one still remained. Then the Franks arrived and entered the city without opposition. George entered the palace and found it untouched, as al-Hasan had taken only the portable royal treasures. Several of his concubines were still there. George saw storerooms full of precious treasures and every rare object, the like of which is seldom to be found. He sealed it all and assembled al-Hasan’s concubines in his palace.

Those of the line of Zīrī ibn Manād who reigned, down to al-Hasan, were nine in number. The period of their rule was 208 years, from the year 335 [946] until 543 [1148]. One of his commanders had been sent by al-Hasan to Roger with a message and he took a safe-conduct for himself and his family and did not leave with the others. When the city was taken, it was sacked for two hours and then a general safe-conduct was proclaimed. Those who had hidden themselves emerged. On the morning of the following day George sent to the Arabs who were nearby. When they came to him, he treated them generously and gave them handsome sums of money. He also sent out several of the troops of Mahdiyya who had remained behind with a guarantee of security for the people of Mahdiyya who had left and with mounts on which they could carry their infants and their women. They had come close to perishing from hunger, although they had hidden wealth and deposits in Mahdiyya. When the guarantee reached them, they returned and before a week had passed most of the inhabitants had come back.

Al-Hasan, however, continued with his family and children, of whom there were twelve sons apart from the female members, and his personal retainers, making his way to Muhriz ibn Ziyād,³ who was at La Malga.⁴ He was met on the

³ Abū Maḥfūz Muhriz was emir of the Riyāḥi Arabs (see *EI*(2), v, 59–61, s.v. Banū Khurāṣān).

⁴ In Arabic: al-Mu'allaqa (between Tunis and Carthage). See Idris, *La Berbérie*, 234–5.

road by an Arab emir, called Ḥasan ibn Tha'lab, who demanded money from him that was due to him for [128] his administration. Al-Ḥasan could not produce any money lest it [all] be seized. He handed over his son Yaḥyā as a pledge and continued on his way. On the second day he came to Muḥriz, whom he had favoured over all the Arabs and treated generously, having given him much of his wealth. Muḥriz gave him a handsome welcome and expressed his pain at what had befallen him. For several months al-Ḥasan remained with him, although he was not content with his stay. He wanted to travel to Egypt, to the Caliph al-Ḥāfiẓ the Alid, and purchased a ship for his journey. George the Frank heard of this and deployed galleys to seize him. Therefore al-Ḥasan gave up this plan and determined to go to 'Abd al-Mu'min in the Maghrib. He sent his older sons, Yaḥyā, Tamīm and 'Alī to Yaḥyā ibn al-'Azīz, one of the Banū Hammād, who were cousins, asking permission to come to him, renew his acquaintance and travel on from there to 'Abd al-Mu'min. Yaḥyā gave his permission, so he set out. When he arrived, Yaḥyā would not meet him but sent him and his sons to Jazā'ir Banī Mazghannān.⁵ He appointed men to guard him and deprive all of them of freedom of action. They remained in this state until 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered Bougie in the year 547 [1152-3]. He came before him then and under that year we have told what happened to him.

After George had become established in Mahdiyya, a week later he sent a fleet to the city of Sfax and another one to Susa. When the population of Susa heard the news of Mahdiyya, the governor, 'Alī the son of Emir al-Ḥasan, left to go to his father. The people left at the same time and the Franks entered without a fight on 12 Ṣafar [2 July 1148]. On the other hand, the people of Sfax were joined by many Arabs and, strengthened by them, when the Franks attacked them, they sallied forth against them. The Franks feigned flight and the people pursued until they were far from the city. The Franks then wheeled around to meet them. Some fled back to the city and some into the open country. Many were killed. The Franks entered the city after fierce fighting with many slain. The surviving men were taken prisoner and the women enslaved. This was on 23 Ṣafar [13 July]. Guarantees were then proclaimed and the populace returned to the city and ransomed their womenfolk and children. They and the people of Susa and Mahdiyya were treated mildly. Later on, letters came from Roger to all the population of Ifrīqiya, [129] with guarantees of life and property and fair promises.

When the state of the country became settled, George proceeded with a fleet to the castle of Kelibia,⁶ which is a strong castle. After his arrival the Arabs heard this news and assembled there. The Franks disembarked to attack and in a battle they were defeated and a large number of them killed. They withdrew discomfited to Mahdiyya. The Franks now held from Tripoli to close to Tunis and the Maghrib almost up to Qayrawan. God knows best!⁷

⁵ The text has Jazīrat etc., but cf. below p. [159]. This is modern Algiers.

⁶ In Arabic: Iqlībiya, a fortress on the peninsula of Cape Bon.

⁷ See Idris, *La Berbérie*, 355-61 (fall of Mahdiyya), 361-3 (flight of al-Ḥasan).

How the Franks besieged Damascus and what Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī did

This year the king of the Germans⁸ came from his lands with a great host and large following of Franks, aiming to attack Islamic territory and not doubting that he would conquer it with the easiest of fighting because of the great multitude of his following and the abundance of his money and equipment. On his arrival in Syria, the Franks there sought him out and waited upon him, obeying his every command and prohibition. He ordered them to march with him to besiege and take Damascus, as he asserted. They duly set out with him, came to the city and put it under siege. The ruler there was Muṣṭir al-Dīn Abaq ibn Būrī ibn Ṭughtakīn, although he had no authority at all. All power in the city belonged to Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur, a mamluke of his grandfather, Ṭughtakīn, and he it was who had installed Muṣṭir al-Dīn. Mu‘īn al-Dīn was intelligent, just, charitable and of excellent conduct. He gathered the troops and defended the city.

The Franks maintained their siege and then on 6 Rabī‘ I [25 July 1148] they launched an assault with both their cavalry and infantry. The populace and the regular troops went out to meet them and held firm against them. Among those who went forth to fight was the lawyer, Proof of the Religion (*Hujjat al-Dīn*) Yūsuf ibn Dirbās al-Findalāwī al-Maghribī.⁹ He was a great shaykh and a learned lawyer. When Mu‘īn al-Dīn saw him, [130] as he marched on foot, he went to him, greeted him and said, ‘Shaykh, you are excused because of your great age. We will undertake the defence of the Muslims,’ and he asked him to retire. He refused and said, ‘I sold and He bought from me. By God, I shall not back out nor ask Him to cancel.’ He alluded to the words of God Almighty: ‘Verily God has purchased from the believers their lives and goods in return for Paradise.’¹⁰ He advanced and fought the Franks and was in the end killed at al-Nayrab¹¹ about half a league from Damascus.

The Franks grew strong while the Muslims weakened. The German emperor advanced and camped at the Green Hippodrome.¹² The people were convinced that he would conquer the city. Mu‘īn al-Dīn had sent to Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, calling on him to come to the aid of the Muslims and to drive the enemy from them. Accordingly he gathered his troops and set out for Syria, taking with him his brother, Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, from Aleppo. They camped at Homs

⁸ This section contains Ibn al-Athīr’s account of the Second Crusade. The Emperor Conrad III is intended. There is no special mention of the French king, Louis VII.

⁹ A Mālikī lawyer, whose father’s name is given as Dī Nās in *Kāmil*, as Dhūnās in *Rawḍatayn*, i, 190 (ostensibly quoting Ibn al-Athīr), Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 200–201, and *Wāfi*, xxix, 195–6. Dirbās is supplied by *Wafayāt*, ii, 452.

¹⁰ Koran, ix, 111.

¹¹ A suburb north-east of Damascus (Elisséeff, 252).

¹² Arabic: *al-maydān al-akhdar*, situated about 1 km west of the NW corner of the city between the rivers Baradā and Bānyās.

and he sent to Mu‘īn al-Dīn, saying, ‘I have come, bringing with me all who bear arms in my lands. I want my deputies to be in Damascus, so that I may come and confront the Franks. If I am defeated, I and my troops can enter the city and protect ourselves within. If I am victorious, the city is yours and I shall not dispute it with you.’

He also sent to the Franks, threatening them if they did not withdraw from the city. The Franks slackened their attacks, fearing the large number of wounded and because of the possibility that they would be obliged to fight Sayf al-Dīn. They spared themselves with the result that the populace became stronger for their defence of the city and also had a respite from continuous warfare. Mu‘īn al-Dīn wrote to the newly-arrived Franks, ‘The ruler of the East has come. If you do not withdraw, I shall surrender the city to him and then you will be sorry.’ On the other hand, he sent to the Franks of Syria, to say to them, ‘By what reasoning do you aid these men against us? You know that, if they take Damascus, they will seize the coastal lands that you have in your hands. For myself, if I see that I am too weak to hold the city, I shall surrender it to Sayf al-Dīn, and you know that, if he controls Damascus, he will not allow you to retain any foothold in Syria.’ They agreed with him to withdraw cooperation with the German emperor [131] and Mu‘īn al-Dīn offered to hand over to them the castle of Bānyās.

The Levantine Franks met with the German emperor and warned him against Sayf al-Dīn, his large forces and his constant supply of reinforcements. ‘Possibly he would take Damascus and you will be too weak to resist him.’ They continued to press him until he withdrew from the city. They then received the surrender of Bānyās and the Germans returned to their own lands beyond Constantinople. Thus God saved the believers from their evil.

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū'l-Qāsim ibn ‘Asākir has mentioned in his *History of Damascus* that one of the ulema related to him that he saw al-Findalāwī in a dream. He asked him, ‘How has God treated you? Where are you?’ He replied, ‘He has forgiven me. We are in the Gardens of Eden, face to face on couches.’¹³

How Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī took the fortress of al-‘Urayma

After the Franks had withdrawn from Damascus, Nūr al-Dīn marched to the fortress of al-‘Urayma,¹⁴ which was held by the Franks, and took it.

The reason for this was that, when the German emperor set out for Syria, he had with him the son¹⁵ of Alfonso, a scion of Frankish princes, whose grandfather was the one who took Syrian Tripoli from the Muslims. He took and gained control of the fortress of al-‘Urayma and declared openly that he intended to take Tripoli

¹³ Reading *innā* rather than *ana*. A slightly altered version of Koran, xxxvii, 44.

¹⁴ Situated north of the Homs/Tripoli gap, it is sometimes called Arima (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 68–73).

¹⁵ Bertrand, illegitimate son of the Count of Toulouse Alfonso-Jordan, son of Raymond I.

from the Count.¹⁶ The latter sent to Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who had met with Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur in Baalbek, saying to him and Mu‘īn al-Dīn that they should attack al-‘Urayma and take it from the son of Alfonso. They both set out with their troops on forced marches and sent to Sayf al-Dīn, who was at Homs, asking for his aid. [132] He reinforced them with a large force under Emir ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaysī, lord of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar and elsewhere. They camped about the fortress and put it under siege. Alfonso’s son was within and he mounted a strong defence. The Muslims attacked more than once. The sappers went forward and mined the wall. Then the Franks there surrendered and the Muslims took possession, seizing all within, cavalry and infantry, male and female, including the son of Alfonso. They demolished the fortress and returned to Sayf al-Dīn. For Alfonso’s son the following saying is appropriate: ‘The ostrich went out, seeking two horns and returned minus both ears.’

The disagreement between Sultan Mas‘ūd and several emirs, their coming to Baghdad and what they did in Iraq.

During this year a group of senior emirs broke with Sultan Mas‘ūd, namely from Azerbayjan Īldikiz al-Mas‘ūdī, lord of Ganja and Arraniyya, and Qayṣar; from the Uplands Alpqush Kūn Khar and Tatar the Chamberlain,¹⁷ another of Mas‘ūd’s mamlukes, and Ṭurunṭāy al-Maḥmūdī, the prefect of Wāsiṭ, and Īldikiz, Qurqūb and the son of Ṭughāyuruk.

The reason for this was the sultan’s preference for Khāṣṣ Beg and his neglect of them. They feared that he would treat them as he treated ‘Abd al-Rahmān, ‘Abbās and Būz-Aba, so they broke with him and set out for Iraq. When they reached Ḥulwān, the people in Baghdad and the districts of Iraq became fearful and prices rose. The [Caliph] Imam al-Muqtafi li-Amr Allāh ordered the city wall to be repaired and restored. He also sent al-‘Ibādī the Preacher to them but they paid no attention to his words. They came to Bagdad in [133] Rabī‘ II [19 August–16 September 1148], accompanied by Prince Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, and camped on the East Bank. Mas‘ūd Bilāl, the prefect of Bagdad,¹⁸ left the city, fearful of the caliph, and went to Takrit, which was held by him. The situation was serious for the people of Bagdad. ‘Alī ibn Dubays, lord of al-Ḥilla, came to them and camped on the West Bank. The caliph raised troops for his own protection.

Fighting broke out between the emirs and the Bagdad populace and local troops. They fought several times and one day the ‘Ajamī emirs fled from the mob

¹⁶ Raymond II.

¹⁷ According to *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 225, Khāṣṣ Beg, using his dominant position, arrested and killed Tatar in Rabī‘ I/20 July–18 August 1148.

¹⁸ Bundārī, 234, calls him Mas‘ūd al-Bilālī. He was Sultan Mas‘ūd’s appointee and represented Saljuq military power in Bagdad.

as a trick and strategem. The mob pursued them but when they had gone some distance the emirs turned to face them and some troops appeared behind them. They were put to the sword and a great crowd of the populace were slain. Neither young nor old were spared. Great slaughter was done and the people of Baghdad suffered an unparalleled disaster. The dead and wounded were numerous and many were captured, of whom some were later killed and some publicly pilloried. Those known to people were buried but those unknown were left lying out in the open country. The troops scattered throughout the western quarters and looted much property from their inhabitants. They sacked the town of Dujayl and others and seized women and children.

Later the emirs gathered and camped opposite the Tāj, where they kissed the earth and made their apologies. Until the end of the day envoys went back and forth between them and the caliph. They returned to their tents and set out for Ḥulwān, plundering the countryside and doing wicked deeds. Mas‘ūd Bilāl, the prefect of Baghdad, returned to Baghdad from Takrit. The emirs then broke up and left Iraq. Emir Qayṣar died in Azerbayjan. All this happened while Sultan Mas‘ūd remained in the Uplands, with envoys constantly going between him and his uncle, Sultan Sanjar. The latter had sent, blaming him for his advancement of Khāṣṣ Beg and ordering him to send him away, threatening that, if he did not do so, he would come against him [134] and remove him from the sultanate. Mas‘ūd was prevaricating and not obeying, so Sultan Sanjar set out for Rayy. When Sultan Mas‘ūd learnt of his arrival,¹⁹ he went to him, begged for his good pleasure and persuaded him not to carry out his intention. Thus the situation was calmed. They met in the year 544 [1149–50] as we shall relate, God willing.

Account of the Franks' defeat at Yaghra

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī defeated the Franks at a place called Yaghra²⁰ in Syria. They had mustered with the aim of raiding the districts of Aleppo. He learnt about them and marched against them with his army. They met at Yaghra and fought a fierce battle which ended with the defeat of the Franks. Many of them were slain and several of their commanders taken prisoner. Only a few of this host escaped. Some of the booty and the captives were sent to his brother Sayf al-Dīn, to the caliph at Baghdad, to Sultan Mas‘ūd or to others.

Concerning this battle, in his ode which begins, ‘Would that the dam were blocked or not, and would that sleep were rejected,’ Ibn al-Qaysarānī²¹ says the following verses about Nūr al-Dīn:

¹⁹ Sanjar came to Rayy in Sha‘bān 543/15 December 1148–12 January 1149 (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 227).

²⁰ See Eddé, *Description*, 263: north-east of the Antioch Depression (al-‘Amq) and east of Nahr al-Aswad (or Qarā Su, ‘Black River’).

²¹ Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Qaysarānī died at Damascus in 548/1153.

How should we not celebrate our praiseworthy (*mahmūd*) life, when the sultan is praiseworthy,
 And the sword of Islam is only turned aside when the carcass of Unbelief is cut
 in slices.
 Virtuous deeds are only found where the Light of Religion (*Nūr al-Dīn*) is
 present.
 How many a battle has he, whose day is marked well by the infidel princes!

[135] How the Ghūr took Ghazna and then withdrew

During this year Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn, the ruler of the Ghūr,²² attacked Ghazna and conquered it. The reason was that his brother, the ruler of the Ghūr before him, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn, became the brother-in-law of Bahrām Shāh Mas‘ūd, the ruler of Ghazna and a member of the house of Sabuktakīn.²³ On account of this marriage-relationship his importance grew and his ambition expanded. He gathered many groups and marched to Ghazna to seize it. It has been reported that he set out claiming that he was making a visit of homage, although he was intending trickery and treachery. Bahrām Shāh heard about him and, having seized him, put him in prison, then killed him. The Ghūr were outraged at his killing but were unable to take revenge.

After he was killed, his brother Sām ibn al-Ḥusayn succeeded but he died of smallpox and his brother Prince Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn became the next ruler of the lands of the Ghūr. His position became powerful and his rule well established. He raised an army of horse and foot and marched to Ghazna, seeking blood-revenge for his slain brother and also to conquer Ghazna. He arrived and took it in Jumādā I of the year 543 [17 September-16 October 1148].

Bahrām Shāh departed for India. He gathered large forces and returned to Ghazna, with his advance guard commanded by al-Salār, al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm al-‘Alawī, the emir of Hindūstān. The hearts of the Ghazna army, who had remained with Sūrī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī and entered his service, were still with Bahrām Shāh; their loyalty to Sūrī was only superficial. When Sūrī and Bahrām Shāh met in battle, the army of Ghazna turned to Bahrām Shāh, joined him and handed over Sūrī, the Ghūr ruler. Bahrām Shāh took Ghazna in Muḥarram of the year 544 [11 May-9 June 1149]. Also in Muḥarram of that year Prince Sūrī was crucified along with al-Sayyid al-Māhiyānī.

²² Ghūr refers to a mountainous area in central Afghanistan, the main town of which was Firūzkūh, and to the region's inhabitants (see *EI*(2), ii, 1096). For the dynasty that arose in this area, the Ghurids, see *EI*(2), ii, 1099-1104, and the general account below s.a. 547/1152-3. The ruins of Firūzkūh are at Jām on the middle Hari Rūd about 200 km. east of Herat (see Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*, 6).

²³ Sabuktakīn, the leading emir of the Samanids (died 387/997) and father of Mahmūd of Ghazna (born 361/971, died 421/1030).

[136] Sūrī was a man of outstanding worth, possessed of abundant generosity and great virtue. For the poor he used to throw [purses of] dirhams in slings to fall into the hands of whoever were the lucky ones.

Later the Ghūr returned to take Ghazna which they razed. We have mentioned this under the year 547 [1152–3], where we have related the beginning of the Ghūrid state because it was at that time that their standing became great. They abandoned the mountains and came into Khurasan. Their importance grew. There is some disagreement about this,²⁴ as we have mentioned. God knows best!

How the Franks took some cities in Andalusia

In Andalusia this year the Franks took Tortosa²⁵ and along with it they took all its castles and the fortresses of Lérida and Fraga. In those parts there was nothing the Muslims held that was not seized by the Franks because of the internal dissensions of the Muslims and all has remained in their hands until now.

Miscellaneous events

This year Abū Bakr al-Mubārak ibn al-Kāmil ibn Abī Ghālib al-Baghdādī, whose father was known as al-Khaffāf, died. He studied much Ḥadīth and was the scholar of Baghdad from whom many benefitted.²⁶

[137] This year prices in Iraq rose very high and foodstuffs were impossible to obtain because of the army that came. The people from the surrounding countryside came to Baghdad as refugees, having been robbed of their possessions, and they perished hungry and naked. Throughout most lands there was a similar dearth, in Khurasan, the Uplands, Isfahan and Fars, the Jazīra and Syria. In the Maghrib, however, the famine and high prices were worse because of the interruption of the rains and the invasion of the enemy.

There died in this year:

Ibrāhīm ibn Nabahān al-Ghanawī al-Raqqī, who was born in the year 459 [1066–7]. He was a pupil of al-Ghazālī and al-Shāshī and transmitted the digest of *The Two Genuine Collections*²⁷ by al-Ḥumaydī, direct from the author.²⁸

The Imam Abū'l-Faḍl al-Kirmānī, the Ḥanafī lawyer and leading scholar of Khurasan, in Dhū'l-Qa'da [13 March–11 April 1149].

²⁴ Reading *fī-hi ba'ḍ al-khulf* as in Ms Pococke 346, fol. 109a, rather than *fī ba'ḍ al-khulf*.

²⁵ See *EI*(2), x, 738–9, s.v. Ṭurṭusha.

²⁶ Born 495/1101–2; died Jumādā I/September–October 1148 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 137).

²⁷ For Sunni Islam the two most important collections of Ḥadīth, the *Ṣaḥīḥān* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

²⁸ Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Nabahān, died the eve of Thursday 4 Dhū'l-Hijja/= 14 April 1149 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 134).

The death of Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, some account of his life and the accession of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn

This year the lord of Mosul, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, son of Atabeg Zankī, died there of a feverish illness. When his illness grew serious, he sent to Baghdad and summoned Awḥad al-Zamān. When he attended him, he saw how serious his illness was. He treated him but his medicines had no healing effect. Ghāzī died towards the end of Jumādā II [ended 3 November 1149]. His reign lasted three years, one month and twenty days. He was handsome and youthful and had been born in the year 500 [1106–7]. He was buried in the madrasah that he built in Mosul. He left a single male child whom his uncle Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd raised and brought up well, marrying him to the daughter of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd. He did not live long but died in the prime of his youth. Thus Ghāzī's line came to an end.

He was a generous, brave and intelligent man. Twice every day he used to provide a large meal for his regular troops, in the morning and the evening. The morning one would consist of a hundred head of prime sheep. He was the first person to have his banner carried over his head and he ordered his soldiers not to ride without a sword at the waist and a mace beneath the knee. After he introduced this practice, all the provincial rulers imitated him. He built the old Atabakiyya Madrasah in Mosul, one of the most handsome of madrasahs, which he endowed [139] for Ḥanafī and Shāfi‘ī lawyers, and also a hospice for Sufis, again in Mosul, at the Wharf Gate. His reign did not last long enough to allow him to do all the good in his heart. He had high aspirations. An example of his generosity is that Shihāb al-Dīn Ḥayṣa Bayṣa¹ came to his court and praised him with an ode which began:

How long will glory see you in a poet's garb,
After the pulpits' tops have pined away with longing?

Ghāzī rewarded him with a thousand dinars in cash, apart from robes of honour and other things.

When Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī died, his brother Quṭb al-Dīn was dwelling in Mosul. Jamāl al-Dīn, the vizier, and Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī, the commander of the army, agreed

¹ ‘Dire Straits’, the nickname of the poet Abū'l-Fawāris al-Tamīmī (died 574/1179), see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 279. For the verses that follow, see Ḥayṣa Bayṣa, *Dīwān*, ii. 316.

to make him the successor. They fetched him and took sworn oaths from him and themselves swore to him. They brought him on horseback to the palace of the sultanate with Zayn al-Dīn holding his stirrup. All the lands of his brother Sayf al-Dīn, such as Mosul, the Jazīra and Syria, gave him allegiance.

After his accession he married the Lady, daughter of Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, whom his brother Sayf al-Dīn had married, only to die before consummating the marriage. She was the mother of Qutb al-Dīn's children, Sayf al-Dīn [Ghāzī II], 'Izz al-Dīn and others.

How Nūr al-Dīn took control of Sinjār

When Qutb al-Dīn Mawdūd² came to rule in Mosul after his brother Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, his older brother Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd was in Syria, in possession of Aleppo and Hama. A number of emirs wrote to him, asking for him, among them al-Muqaddam 'Abd al-Malik, the father of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad,³ who was at that time [140] governor of Sinjār. He sent to him, inviting him to come, so that he could take over Sinjār. Nūr al-Dīn set out lightly equipped, leading seventy mounted men, emirs of his state.

He came to Māksīn with a handful of men, having outstripped his companions. It was a day of heavy rain. The person in command of the gate did not recognize them and informed the prefect that a band of Turkomans, the auxiliary troops, had entered the town. Hardly had he finished his report before Nūr al-Dīn entered the palace into the prefect's presence, who rose to his feet and kissed his hand. The rest of his company caught up with him and he travelled on to Sinjār.

He sent to al-Muqaddam to tell him of his arrival. His messenger saw that he had gone to Mosul and left his son, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad, in the citadel. The latter told him that his father had set out for Mosul and he organized someone to catch up with his father on the road and tell him of Nūr al-Dīn's arrival. So al-Muqaddam returned to Sinjār and handed it over to Nūr al-Dīn, who made his entry and sent for Fakhr al-Dīn Qarā Arslān, lord of Ḥisn [Kayfā], asking him to join him because of the friendship that existed between them. He came to him with his troops. When Atabeg Qutb al-Dīn, Jamāl al-Dīn and Zayn al-Dīn in Mosul heard of this, they gathered their troops and marched towards Sinjār. When they had come as far as Tell Ya'far, envoys went to and fro between them. They had planned to attack Nūr al-Dīn in Sinjār. Jamāl al-Dīn said to them, 'It is not sound sense to take issue with him and fight him. We have built him up in the eyes of the sultan and made much of his role in the Jihad. We have presented ourselves as subordinate to him. Meanwhile he shows the Franks that he respects us⁴ and that

² See an account of his career in *EI*(2), vi, 870–71.

³ Shams al-Dīn ibn al-Muqaddam was to be an important supporter of Saladin.

⁴ This is the reading of the text's footnote, which the context demands.

he is our subject. He is always saying to them, "If you are not as you ought to be, I shall surrender the country to the lord of Mosul [141] and then he will deal with you." If we confront him and defeat him, the sultan will turn his ambitions towards us and say, "This person whom they were vaunting and hiding behind is weaker than they are. They have defeated him." However, if he defeats us, the Franks will turn their ambitions towards him and say, "Those whose support he relied on are weaker than he is. He has defeated them." And when all is said and done, he is the son of the great Atabeg.'

He advised peace and after a visit to Nūr al-Dīn an agreement was reached. Sinjār was handed to his brother Quṭb al-Dīn and Nūr al-Dīn took over⁵ Homs and al-Rahba in Syria. Syria remained his and the regions of Jazira his brother's. After reaching agreement, Nūr al-Dīn returned to Syria and took with him all the monies and stores that his father, the martyred Atabeg, had amassed, which were very extensive indeed.

Account of the death of al-Ḥāfiẓ, the accession of al-Zāfir and the vizierate of Ibn al-Salār

In Jumādā II of this year [October 1149] there died al-Ḥāfiẓ li-Dīn Allāh ‘Abd al-Majīd, son of Emir Abū'l-Qāsim ibn al-Mustansīr bi-Allāh the Alid, ruler of Egypt, whose caliphate had lasted twenty years all but five months. He was about seventy-seven years of age. Throughout all these years he was dominated by his all-powerful viziers, so that in the end he appointed his son, Ḥasan, as vizier and heir apparent but he too dominated him and seized all power for himself. He murdered many emirs of the state and extorted money from many others. When al-Ḥāfiẓ saw this, he gave him poison to drink and he died, as we have already related.⁶

Of the Egyptian Alids who ruled there was none whose father was not caliph other than al-Ḥāfiẓ [142] and al-‘Ādīd. We shall be giving an account of the genealogy of al-‘Ādīd. Al-Ḥāfiẓ ‘Abd al-Majīd's successor as caliph in Egypt was his son, al-Zāfir bi-Amr Allāh Abū Manṣūr Ismā‘īl,⁷ who appointed Ibn Maṣāl as vizier. For forty days the latter survived to administer the affairs of state and then al-‘Ādīl ibn al-Salār marched against him from Alexandria and challenged him for the office of vizier. Ibn Maṣāl had left Cairo to hunt down some evil-doers from Sudan. Al-‘Ādīl succeeded him in Cairo and became vizier.

‘Abbās ibn Abī'l-Futūḥ ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu'izz ibn Bādīs al-Şanhājī, who was the step-son of al-‘Ādīl, was sent with an army against Ibn

⁵ Reading *wa-tasallama*.

⁶ See *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), pp. [22-3].

⁷ The twelfth Fatimid caliph, born 527/1133, reigned 544-9/1149-54; see *EI*(2), xi, 382-3.

Maṣāl, whom he defeated and killed. He then returned to Cairo and al-‘Ādil became firmly established in power. Alongside him the caliph had no authority at all.

‘Abbās had come to Egypt because his grandfather Yaḥyā had expelled his father, Abū'l-Futūḥ, from Mahdiyya and then, when Yaḥyā died and his son ‘Alī succeeded as ruler of Ifrīqiya, he expelled his brother Abū'l-Futūḥ, the father of ‘Abbās, from Ifrīqiya in the year 509 [1115–6]. He came to Egypt with his wife, Ballāra the daughter of al-Qāsim ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādīs, and his son, this ‘Abbās, when he was young and still being suckled. Abū'l-Futūḥ took up residence in Alexandria and was respected during the little time he remained there. After his death his wife Ballāra married al-‘Ādil ibn al-Salār.

‘Abbās grew up and gained favour with al-Ḥāfiẓ, so that eventually he became vizier after al-‘Ādil, for the latter was killed in Muḥarram of the year 548 [1153–4]. It is said that ‘Abbās instigated those who slew him. After the murder he took on the office of vizier and exercised it with firmness. He was a bold and determined man, but despite this it was during his days that the Franks took Ascalon. This was a cause of further weakening of the dynasty. During his days in office Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd took Damascus from Mujīr al-Dīn Abaq and after that matters developed until Egypt was taken from the dynasty, as we shall later narrate, God Almighty willing.

[143] How several emirs returned to Iraq

In Rajab of this year [November 1149] Alpqush Kūn Khar, al-Ṭurunṭā’ī and Dubays, accompanied by Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, returned to Iraq and made contact with the caliph about making the khutbah for Malikshāh. The caliph paid them no attention, gathered his forces and fortified Baghdad. He also sent to Sultan Mas‘ūd to inform him of the situation. The latter promised to come to Baghdad but did not appear.

This was because of what we have related before, namely his uncle Sanjar’s coming to Rayy concerning the matter of Khāṣṣ Beg. When he arrived at Rayy, Sultan Mas‘ūd went to him, met and attempted to win his good pleasure. Sanjar declared his satisfaction with him. When Alpqush heard of the caliph’s correspondence with Mas‘ūd, he sacked al-Nahrawān and arrested Emir ‘Alī ibn Dubays in Ramaḍān [January 1150]. Hearing of this, al-Ṭurunṭā’ī fled to al-Nu’māniyya.

Sultan Mas‘ūd came to Baghdad in the middle of Shawwāl [15 February 1150]. Alpqush Kūn Khar departed from al-Nahrawān and freed ‘Alī ibn Dubays. When the sultan reached Baghdad, ‘Alī went to find him, threw himself at his feet and asked for forgiveness. He was accepted back into the sultan’s good graces. A certain historian mentioned this sequence of events under the year 544 [1149–50] and also mentioned the same under the year 543 [1148–9], thinking that they were

two separate occurrences. I think that it was a single one. However, I have followed him, while bringing attention to this matter.⁸

[144] Account of the killing of the Prince, lord of Antioch, and the defeat of the Franks

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī raided Frankish territory in the direction of Antioch. He marched to the fortress of Ḥārim, which belonged to the Franks, besieged it, destroyed its suburbs and ransacked its hinterland. He then left to go to the fortress of Inab, which he also besieged. The Franks gathered with the Prince, lord of Antioch, Ḥārim and those regions, and moved towards Nūr al-Dīn to force him to depart from Inab. However, he stayed to meet them and a fierce battle was fought. Nūr al-Dīn took a direct part in the fighting that day. The Franks suffered a very bad defeat and a great number of them were killed and a like number captured.

One of those killed was the Prince, lord of Antioch.⁹ He was one of the most intransigent of the Franks and one of their great leaders. After his death his son, Bohemond, who was still a child, succeeded. His mother married a second prince to rule the land until her son grew up. He remained with her in Antioch.¹⁰

Later Nūr al-Dīn carried out another raid against them. They mustered again and confronted him but were defeated, losing men killed or captured. Amongst those taken was the second prince, Bohemond's step-father.¹¹ Thereupon Bohemond took control in Antioch. The poets made much praise of Nūr al-Dīn in congratulation for this victory, as the killing of the Prince had a great effect on both sides. One of those poets was [Ibn] al-Qaysarānī in his celebrated ode which begins:

[145] These are the resolves, not what pens claim;
These are the noble qualities, not what books mention.
These are the ambitions, which, when they are sought,
Poems and sermons stumble along in their tracks.
O son of ‘Imād al-Dīn, you have shaken hands with their highest
With a hand fit for great endeavours, achieved with toil.
Your forbear did not cease to build every lofty building
Until he built a dome whose props¹² are meteors.

⁸ The historian in question is Ibn al-Jawzī. For his narrative under the year 543, see *Muntaẓam*, x, 131–3, and for 544, see op. cit., x, 137–8.

⁹ This was Raymond of Poitiers, who had married Constance, daughter of Bohemond II of Antioch. The battle was fought on 30 June 1149.

¹⁰ Constance married Reynald de Chatillon, who acted as regent for her son, Bohemond III.

¹¹ This can only refer to the much later capture of Reynald de Chatillon in November 1160.

¹² Literally ‘tent-pegs’.

Your swords have produced in the Franks a shaking
 Which makes the heart of great Rome beat fast.
 You have struck their chief a crushing blow with them
 Which has destroyed his backbone and brought the crosses low.
 You have cleansed the enemy's land of their blood
 In a cleansing that has made every sword polluted.

Account of the dispute between the ruler of Sicily and the Byzantine emperor

During this year there was a disagreement between Roger the Frank, ruler of Sicily, and the emperor of Constantinople.¹³ Many battles took place between them which continued over several years. They distracted one another from the Muslims. Had that not been the case, Roger would have taken all the lands of Ifrīqiya.

The fighting between them took place on land and at sea. Victory in all of it went to the ruler of Sicily, so much so that in one year his fleet came to the city of Constantinople and entered the mouth of the harbour, where they captured several of the Byzantine galleys and took a number of prisoners. The Franks shot arrows at the windows of the imperial palace. The person who did these feats against the Byzantines and the Muslims too was George, the Sicilian ruler's vizier. He fell ill with a number of illnesses, including haemorrhoids and stones. He died in the year 546 [1151–2] and the discord abated. People found relief from his evil and mischief-making. The ruler of Sicily did not have anyone who could fill his place after him.

[146] Miscellaneous events

This year there was a serious earthquake. It is said that a mountain opposite Ḥulwān sank into the earth.

This year Abū'l-Muẓaffar Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra became the vizier of the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh. Before that he had been head of the Bureau of Control. He showed great competence when the [besieging] troops camped outside Baghdad and with excellent management he turned them away. The caliph was eager for him and appointed him vizier on Wednesday 4 Rabī' II 544¹⁴ [=10 August 1149]. The Moon was quartiled¹⁵ with Saturn. Someone said to him, 'It would be

¹³ This is Emperor Manuel Comnenos.

¹⁴ In the year 543 on Wednesday 14 Rabī' II/1 September 1148, when the coalition of emirs threatened Baghdad, according to *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 226.

¹⁵ In Arabic *tarbi'* means, in connection with the relative positions of heavenly bodies, 'a quartile aspect', that is, a 90° separation, which, astrologically speaking, is very inauspicious.

better if you delayed donning the robe of office because of these quartile aspects.' He replied, 'What is there more auspicious than becoming the caliph's vizier!' He donned the robe that day.

The Chief Cadi 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Zaynabī died in Muḥarram [11 May-9 June 1149]. The cadi's office was filled by 'Imād al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Dāmghānī

Also in Muḥarram prices fell in Iraq. Good things were abundant and the country people left [Baghdad] for their villages.

The following died this year:

Emir Nazar, the emir of the Pilgrimage. He had left with the pilgrims as far as al-Ḥilla, where he fell ill.¹⁶ His sickness increased and he appointed as his deputy over the pilgrims Qāymāz al-Arjuwānī. He returned to Baghdad in his ill state and died in Dhū'l-Qa'da [March 1150]. He was a eunuch, intelligent and benevolent. He did much good and gave abundant alms.¹⁷

[147] Aḥmad ibn Niẓām al-Mulk, who was vizier of Sultan Muḥammad and of [Caliph] al-Mustarshid bi-Allāh.

'Alī ibn Rāfi' ibn Khalīfa al-Shaybānī, one of the notables of Khurasan. He was 107 years old in solar years.

The Imam Mas'ūd al-Ṣawābī in Muḥarram.

Mu'īn al-Dīn Unur, the deputy of Abaq, lord of Damascus, although he was the real ruler and holder of authority, while Abaq was emir in form with no substance to it.

Cadi Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Arrajānī, Abū Bakr,¹⁸ cadi of Tustar. He was the author of some good poetry, for example:

When I tested people, seeking amongst them
A trusty brother for when disasters strike,
I viewed both states, ease and hardship,
And called among the living, 'Is there any helper?'
I saw none but a malicious rejoicer at my pains
Or one envious of what gave me delight.
My eyes, you have benefited from a look
And brought my heart most bitter report.
O my eyes, spare my heart, for it is
Wicked for two to strive to kill one.

¹⁶ *Muntaẓam*, x, 138: 'he fell ill at Kufa and turned back.'

¹⁷ Abū'l-Ḥasan Nazar ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Juyūshī performed 27 pilgrimages, at least 20 of them as emir. Ibn al-Jawzī went on the Ḥajj under him in 541/1147 and disapproved of his leadership. He died the eve of Tuesday 21 Dhū'l-Qa'da/21 March 1159 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 141-2).

¹⁸ See *EI*(2), i, 659.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Isā ibn Hibat Allāh ibn ‘Isā al-Bazzāz.¹⁹ He was a man of wit and author of some good poetry. A friend wrote a note to him and exaggerated the form of address; he replied:

You added so much to my form of address that
I feared a decrease in the increase.
Make my address that of my peers
And do not change what I am used to.

¹⁹ i.e. the cloth merchant. *Muntazam*, x, 141, reads al-Naqqāsh (the painter, sculptor?) and also makes it clear that the ‘friend’ about to be mentioned was Ibn al-Jawzī himself.

How the Arabs attacked the pilgrim caravan

On 14 Muḥarram this year [13 May 1150] the Bedouin Arabs, Zughb¹ and their allies, waylaid the pilgrim caravan at al-Gharābī, between Mecca and Medina. They overwhelmed them and only a few escaped.

The reason for this was that Naṣar, the emir of the Pilgrimage, turned back at al-Hilla, as we have mentioned, and Qāymāz al-Arjuwānī, who was an inexperienced youth, travelled with the caravan and took them to Mecca. After the Emir of Mecca had seen Qāymāz, he formed a low opinion of him and became eager to plunder the pilgrims. Qāymāz successfully managed the situation with him until they set out to return.

After he had left Mecca, he heard that the Arabs had gathered and said to the pilgrims, ‘The best course for us is not to go to Medina.’ The Persians caused an uproar and threatened to complain of him to Sultan Sanjar. He therefore said to them, ‘Then give the Bedouin money to buy off the trouble they can make,’ but they refused to do that. He led them as far as al-Gharābī, which is a halt which one comes to after a narrow passage between two mountains. The Arabs stood at the mouth of the pass. Qāymāz and his men fought them but when he saw that he was too weak, he accepted a safe-conduct for himself. The pilgrims were overwhelmed, their goods and all they had with them seized as booty. The people scattered in the desert and very many, too many to count, perished. Only a few survived. [149] Some of them reached Medina and from there were conveyed to their lands. Others remained with the Bedouin until they found their way to settlements.

Later God aided the pilgrims against the Zughb, who continued to dwindle and decline. I saw a youth, one of their clan, in Medina in the year 576 [1180-81]. He and I had a conversation, during which I said to him, ‘By God, I was ready to sympathize with you until I heard that you were of Zughb. I then shrank away and feared trouble from you.’ He said, ‘Why?’ to which I replied, ‘Because of your robbing the pilgrim caravan.’ ‘I was not alive at that time,’ he said. ‘How do you think God has treated us? By God, we have not prospered, nor been successful. Our numbers have dwindled and our enemies are eager to destroy us.’

¹ In *Kāmil* [Z.‘b]. Correct from Qalqashandī, *Ansāb al-‘arab*, 272: ‘The nomadic circuits [of the Banū Zughb] were between the Haramayn [Mecca and Medina]. Then they migrated to the Maghrib and resided in Ifrīqiya.’ See also Idris, *La Berbérie*, 210.

Account of the taking of the castle of Apamea

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, son of the Martyr Zankī, conquered from the Franks the castle of Apamea in the vicinity of Shayzar and Hama on a high hill, one of the strongest and most impregnable of castles. Nūr al-Dīn marched there and put the Franks within under siege. He fought and pressed hard on those in the fortress. The Franks in Syria assembled and marched towards him to force him to raise the siege, but they arrived only after he had taken the place and filled it with stores, weapons, men and everything that was needed. When he heard that the Franks were coming, he left, having completed arrangements for the castle, and marched to meet them. The Franks, when they saw that the castle had been taken and that Nūr al-Dīn had the strong determination to confront them, diverged from their line of march, returned to their own lands and made overtures to him concerning a truce. He himself returned safe and victorious. The poets gave him praise and celebrated this success. An example of this is an ode of Ibn al-Rūmī,² which begins:

The most exalted of realms is one whose beacon you have raised high
And made sharpened sword-blades its nails.
The most worthy to rule the land and its people is
A merciful one, whose justice has embraced its regions.

[150] It continues with a description of the castle³ and it is a long poem.

Account of the Franks' siege of, and withdrawal from, Cordoba

This year 'little sultan', namely Alfonso, king of Toledo and its regions, one of the kings of the Jalāliqa,⁴ a race of Franks, marched with 40,000 horse to the city of Cordoba and put it under siege, when it was in a state of weakness and famine. The news came to 'Abd al-Mu'min at Marrakech. He raised a large army, appointed as commander Abū Zakariyyā Yahyā ibn Yūmūr⁵ and sent him to Cordoba. When they came near the city, they were not able to meet 'little sultan's' army on the plain. They wished to link up with the people of Cordoba to protect it because of the danger of what might happen after the battle. They therefore traversed rugged

² This cannot be the celebrated Ibn al-Rūmī who died in the late 9th century AD. The poet was in fact Ibn Munīr al-Ṭarābulusī (d. 548/1153). See his *Dīwān*, 215–16.

³ Four verses have been omitted here, which are full of obscurities and differ from the text given in the published *Dīwān*, itself equally obscure.

⁴ i.e. the 'Galicians'. Jilliqiyya was the term used for the kingdoms of Asturias and Leon; see *EI*(2), ii, 541–2.

⁵ He was a member of the second-rank of the Almohad hierarchy (the 'People of Fifty') and a one-time governor of Meknès (see Lévi-Provençal, *Documents inédits*, 51, 58, 212–13). For his father's name, correct the text's Y.r.mūz.

mountains and intricate narrows and covered in about twenty-five days' march on difficult terrain the distance of four days' march on easy ground. They arrived at a mountain overlooking Cordoba. When 'little sultan' saw them and realized their plan, he withdrew from Cordoba.

In Cordoba was the Commander Abū'l-Ghamr al-Sā'ib,⁶ a son of Commander Ibn Ghalbūn, [151] one of the heroes and emirs of the Andalusians. When the Franks withdrew, he immediately left the city and climbed up to Ibn Yūmūr and said, 'Come down quickly and enter the city.' They did so and spent the night there. In the morning they saw the troops of 'little sultan' on the summit of the hill where 'Abd al-Mu'min's troops had been. Abū'l-Ghamr said to them, 'This is just what I feared for you, because I knew that 'little sultan' had only moved camp with the desire to bring you to battle. There is an easy route from his former position to the mountain. Had he caught you there, he would have achieved all he wanted from you and from Cordoba.' When 'little sultan' saw that they had eluded him, he realised that he had no hope left of achieving anything against Cordoba. He left and returned home. His siege of Cordoba had lasted three months. God knows best!

How the Ghūr took Herat

This year the ruler of the Ghūr, al-Husayn⁷ ibn al-Ḥusayn marched from the lands of the Ghūr to Herat and besieged it. The inhabitants had written to him and asked to surrender the city to him, to escape the tyranny of the Turks and because they had lost their awe of the sultanate. Herat held out for three days and then the people went out to him, handed over the city and gave their allegiance. He treated them well and poured out his favours upon them, enveloping them with his justice. He professed his allegiance to Sultan Sanjar and that he undertook to be faithful to him and to show him obedience,

Miscellaneous events

During this year 'Alā' al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Mas'ūd, the leading man in Turaythīth, which was in the hands of the Ismā'ilīs, ordered the khutbah to be made for the caliph and for black to be worn.⁸ The preacher complied [152] but 'Alā' al-Dīn's uncle, his relatives and those who agreed with them rose against him. Fighting

⁶ See *EI*(2), iii, 770-71, s.v. Ibn Ghalbūn. His son called Abū'l-Ghamr 'Azzūn died in the battle of Za'bula in Rabi' I 553/April-May 1158.

⁷ This is 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn (Jahānsūz, 'World-burner'), for whose sack of Ghazna see below s.a. 547. For a detailed discussion of his name (*Kāmil* at this point calls him al-Ḥasan) and his career, see *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣiri*, 347-50.

⁸ Black was the ceremonial colour of the Abbasid caliphs. To adopt it signified recognition.

followed and they smashed the minbar and killed the preacher. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn acted thus because his father was a Muslim who, when the Ismā‘īlīs took control at Ṭuraythīth, pretended to conform but secretly nurtured his belief in the Sharia and used to debate in support of the Shāfi‘ī school of law. His leadership role in Ṭuraythīth increased and its affairs proceeded according to his wishes. When he was close to death, he instructed that he should be washed by a Shāfi‘ī lawyer and he recommended to his son, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, that, if he were able, he should restore open adherence to the Sharia of Islam. When he thought that he had the power, he did so but without success.

This year in Iraq there was much sickness, especially in Baghdad. Mortality was high there too. Sultan Mas‘ūd moved away.

Emir ‘Alī ibn Dubays ibn Ṣadaqa, the lord of al-Ḥilla, died this year in Asadābād. His doctor, Muḥammad ibn Ṣalīḥ, was suspected of being involved in a plot to kill him. The doctor himself died soon afterwards.

This year ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn, ruler of the Maghrib, appointed as his vizier Abū Ja‘far ibn Abī Aḥmad al-Andalusī. He had been a captive of his but was described to him as a wise man and an excellent administrator. He freed him from prison and made him vizier. He was the first vizier the Almohads had.

In Muḥarram [May 1150] Yūsuf al-Dimashqī took his chair as professor at the Nizāmiyya in Baghdad. His appointment was made without the caliph’s order, so on Friday he was prevented from entering the mosque. He prayed in the sultan’s mosque but was not allowed to lecture. Sultan Mas‘ūd ordered Shaykh Abū'l-Najīb to lecture in the madrasah but he declined to do so without the caliph’s order. The sultan extorted the caliph’s permission and he began his lecturing in the middle of Muḥarram this year [14 May 1150].

[153] The following died this year:

Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Muhrān, the Shāfi‘ī lawyer. He studied with al-Harrāsī and served as cadi of Nisibis. Later he gave up the position and dwelt in Jazīrat ibn ‘Umar. He then moved to a mountain in the land of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā], to a sufi hospice (*zāwiya*). Manifest saintly deeds were done by him.

Al-Ḥasan ibn Dhī'l-Nūn ibn Abī'l-Qāsim ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Mis‘arī, Abū'l-Mafākhir al-Nīsābūrī. He heard much ḥadīth and was a lawyer, a man of letters, an assiduous scholar and a preacher.⁹ Verses he used to declaim were:

Generous men have died, passed away, ceased and departed.
After them their generous deeds likewise died.
They have left me among men of no honour;
If in slumber they saw a vision of a guest, they would die!

⁹ He died in Jumādā I/August-September 1150. He gained a reputation among the Ḥanbalīs at Baghdad for his support of the Sunna and condemnation of the Ash‘arīs, but according to Ibn al-Jawzī he later confessed a leaning towards a Mu’tazilī belief in the created nature of the Koran (*Muntaẓam*, x, 143–4).

Account of Nūr al-Dīn's defeat at the hands of Joscelin and Joscelin's subsequent capture

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd gathered his army and marched to the lands of Joscelin the Frank, that is, northwards of Aleppo, including Tell Bāshir, ‘Ayntāb, A’zāz and elsewhere. He planned to besiege and take them. Joscelin (God curse him) was the Franks' leading knight, redoubtable. He combined courage and good sense. When he heard of this he assembled the Franks in large numbers and proceeded towards Nūr al-Dīn. They met and fought. The Muslims were defeated and a large number of them were killed or captured. Among those taken was Nūr al-Dīn's armour-bearer (*silāh dār*), who was captured by Joscelin when he had Nūr al-Dīn's armour with him. He sent it to King Mas‘ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, lord of Konya and Aqsaray, and said to him, ‘Here is your son-in-law's armour. Next you will be receiving something much more serious!'

When Nūr al-Dīn learnt what had happened he was outraged by it and devised a plan against Joscelin and banished all rest in order to take his revenge. He summoned a group of Turkoman emirs and offered them incentives if they would seize Joscelin and hand him over, either dead or a prisoner, because he knew that, if he attacked him in person, he would protect himself with his troops and his castles. The Turkomans set spies on him and, when he went out hunting, a group of them caught up with him and secured his person. He bargained with them [155] with an offer to pay them money. They agreed to free him when the money came, so he sent someone to fetch it. However, one of their number went to Abū Bakr ibn al-Dāya,¹ Nūr al-Dīn's deputy in Aleppo, and told him of the situation. He sent him back with some troops, who surprised those Turkomans, while Joscelin was with them, took him prisoner and brought him back to Abū Bakr. His capture was one of the greatest successes because he was an intransigent devil, fierce against the Muslims and cruel. His capture was a blow to all Christendom.

After he was taken, Nūr al-Dīn moved against his castles and took them, namely, Tell Bāshir, ‘Ayntāb, A’zāz, Tell Khālid, Qūrus,² Rāwandān, Burj

¹ The Banū'l-Dāya (sons of the wet-nurse), so called because of the foster-brother relationship with Nūr al-Dīn, played a significant role in his reign. There were three brothers: Shams al-Dīn ‘Uthmān, Badr al-Dīn Ḥasan and Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr.

² Eddé, *Description*, 278–80 and references cited: it is north-west of A’zāz in the upper valley of River ‘Afrīn.

al-Raṣṣāṣ,³ the fortress of al-Bāra, Kafar Sūd,⁴ Kafarlāthā, Dulük,⁵ Mar'ash, Nahr al-Jawz⁶ and others, in a short period of time, details of which will be given.⁷

Whenever Nūr al-Dīn conquered one of these castles he conveyed to it all that any fortress requires, fearing a setback that the Franks might inflict upon the Muslims and to ensure that their lands might not be in need of material to defend them against the enemy. The poets praised him again, one of them being al-Qaysarānī who wrote in an ode concerning Joscelin:

So did fate give the count the gift of his captivity and
 The luckiest opponent⁸ is he whom captivity has seized for you
 He was overweening and greedy a degree beyond his [normal] excess.
 Blasphemy and unbelief destroyed his violence.
 'Azaz became like its name a glory (*'izza*) for you.
 Were it a nest it would be difficult for its two eagles.
 Proceed and fill the world with light and joy,
 For on the dark horizon there is a need for that brightness.
 [156] It's as though I feel his determination (may its edge not be blunted),
 With its destination in the Aqsa. This matter has been decreed
 And Jerusalem is as good as purified.
 There is no purification for it except when it runs with blood.

Account of the siege of Granada and Almeria in Andalusia

During this year 'Abd al-Mu'min sent a large army of about 20,000 horse to Andalusia with Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar ibn Yahyā al-Hintātī. He sent their womenfolk with them. They travelled separately, dressed in black burnouses. They had only eunuchs with them. When any man came near them, he was beaten with whips.

After they had crossed the straits they went to Granada, where was a detachment of the Almoravids. 'Umar and his army besieged it and maintained a tight blockade. Aḥmad ibn Maṭāḥān, lord of the city of Guadix and its districts, came to him with his following. They accepted the beliefs of the Almohads and joined them. Ibrāhīm ibn Hamushk, the father-in-law of Ibn Mardanīsh,⁹ lord of

³ Literally 'Tower of Lead.' It is in modern Turkey, west of 'Ayntāb, see Eddé, *Description*, 60–61.

⁴ This should perhaps be Kafarsūt, near Behesna (see Yāqūt, iv, 288).

⁵ 'A small town in Aleppo province', modern Düllük, 10 km north of Gaziantep (Krawulsky, 598; *EI*(2), ii, 624).

⁶ 'A district between Aleppo and al-Bīra' (Yāqūt, ii, 151).

⁷ This comment which is not in all MSS appears not to be followed up.

⁸ Emending the text to read *wa-as'adu qirnin*.

⁹ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Sa'd (born 518/1124–5, died 567/1172), ruler of Valencia and Murcia who fought the Almohads for 25 years; see *EI*(2), iii, 864–5.

Jaen, and his men also came to them, accepted the tenets of the Almohads and joined their ranks.¹⁰ His army grew very numerous and they urged him to hasten to attack Ibn Mardanīsh, ruler of the eastern part of Andalusia, to surprise with a siege before he could prepare for it.

When Ibn Mardanīsh heard of this, he feared for himself and sent to the ruler of Barcelona in Frankish lands to inform him and to ask for his aid, urging him to come to him. The Franks set out with 10,000 knights. ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s army also marched out and came to the hot spring of Balquwāra,¹¹ which was a day’s march away from Murcia, the capital of Ibn Mardanīsh. [157] They heard of the arrival of the Franks, so he withdrew and besieged Almeria, held by the Franks, for several months. Famine amongst the army became serious and foodstuffs were lacking, so they retired and returned to Seville, where they remained.

Miscellaneous events

In Rabi‘ II [18 July-15 August 1151] al-‘Abbādī the Preacher died in Khūzistān. His name was al-Muẓaffar ibn Ardashīr. The Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh had sent him on an embassy to Prince Muḥammad,¹² son of Sultan Maḥmūd, to make peace between him and Badr al-Huwayzī. He died there and his son held sessions of condolence in Baghdad, supported by a chamberlain from the Caliphal Dīwān. When he held a session, preached and recalled his father, he and all the people would weep. Al-‘Abbādī was brought to Baghdad and buried in al-Shūnīziyya.¹³ He was born in the year 491 [1097-8]. He studied Ḥadīth with Abū Bakr al-Shayrawī, Zāhir al-Shahhāmī and others and was a transmitter.¹⁴

This year the dam at Nahrawān, which Bahrūz had completed, burst because of the excessive rise of the Tāmarrā and the neglect of its maintenance. This was very serious and caused much damage to people.

Emir Qujuq went this year with a body of Sultan Sanjar’s troops to Ṭuraythīth in Khurasan and raided Ismā‘īlī territory. They ransacked, enslaved and destroyed, burning homes. They did terrible things to the inhabitants and returned in safety.

¹⁰ According to *EI*(2), iii, 865, it was in Ramaḍān 564/June 1169 that Ibn Hamushk accepted Almohad beliefs.

¹¹ Several places are named for their hot springs (*ḥamma*), see *EI*(2), iii, 135.

¹² Malikshāh is the son of Maḥmūd named in *Muntazam*, x, 151.

¹³ Kāmil has Shūnīzī. However, Shūnīziyya was a cemetery in West Baghdad, south of the Īsā Canal. See Yāqūt, iii, 338, and Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 79.

¹⁴ *Muntazam*, x, 150-51 (followed by *Wafayāt*, v, 212-13), puts al-‘Abbādī’s death in the following year, Monday, last day of Rabi‘ II 547/= 4 August 1152, and adds that his son died a few months later. On Friday 5 Dhū'l-Hijja of this present year, 546/14 March 1152 al-‘Abbādī’s son, against advice that a non-Ḥanbalī would not be accepted, tried to hold a [preaching] session in Manṣūr’s Mosque on the West Bank. There was a riot but with armed protection he managed to complete a discourse (*Muntazam*, x, 145). Perhaps Ibn al-Athīr confused his notes on the two reports.

How ‘Abd al-Mu’min took Bougie and conquered the Banū Ḥammād

During this year ‘Abd al-Mu’min ibn ‘Alī went to Bougie, which he took and conquered all the lands of the Banū Ḥammād.¹ When he had decided to attack them, he went from Marrakech to Ceuta in the year 546 [1151–2] and remained there for a while, building up his fleet and gathering the nearby troops.

As for the lands on the road to Bougie, he wrote to the people there to make their preparations and to be ready to move at any time he asked for them. People thought that he was planning to cross to Andalusia. He sent to order the suspension of all travel from the eastern Maghrib by land or by sea.

He left Ceuta in Ṣafar 547 [8 May–5 June 1152], making forced marches and rolling up the stages. Troops met him on the road and the people of Bougie were not aware of his coming until he was in their region. The ruler there was Yaḥyā ibn al-‘Azīz ibn Ḥammād, the last of the Banū Ḥammād rulers. He was devoted to hunting and entertainments, paying no attention to the affairs of state. The Banū Ḥamduṇ had come to dominate there. When the news was brought to Maymūn ibn Ḥamduṇ, he gathered his troops and moved out of Bougie towards ‘Abd al-Mu’min. The latter’s advance guard, more than 20,000 mounted men strong, met them. [159] The people of Bougie fled without a fight and ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s advance guard entered Bougie two days before the arrival of ‘Abd al-Mu’min. Yaḥyā ibn al-‘Azīz’s troops all scattered and fled by land and by sea, while Yaḥyā himself took refuge in the castle of Constantine.² His two brothers, al-Ḥārith and ‘Abd Allāh, fled to Sicily. ‘Abd al-Mu’min entered Bougie and conquered all the lands of [Yaḥyā] ibn al-‘Azīz without a battle.

Later Yaḥyā submitted to ‘Abd al-Mu’min on the basis of a guarantee which he granted him. When al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī’s lands in Ifriqiya were taken from him, Yaḥyā had openly rejoiced, for he had been denigrating him and publishing his faults. However, it was not long before his own lands were seized. Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī came to ‘Abd al-Mu’min in Jazā’ir Banī Mazghannān. We have mentioned under the year 543 [1148–9] the reason for his travelling there. They both met with ‘Abd al-Mu’min who sent Yaḥyā ibn al-‘Azīz to the Maghrib, where he remained, in receipt of a large pension. Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī was treated very well, being made a close companion and given a high position. He stayed close to ‘Abd al-Mu’min

¹ A central Maghrib dynasty (405–547/1015–1152), related to the Zirids and founded by Ḥammād ibn Buluggin ibn Zīrī (died 419/1028); see *EI*(2), iii, 137–9, s.v. Ḥammādids.

² In Arabic Qusantīnat al-Hawā’, i.e. Constantine ‘of the air’, because of its situation on a high plateau with deep ravines around. See *EI*(2), v, 530–32.

until the conquest of Mahdiyya. Al-Hasan was established there and the governor was ordered to follow his advice and defer to what he said.

When ‘Abd al-Mu’min took Bougie, he did not lay hands on the inhabitants’ money or anything else. The reason for this was that the Banū Hamdūn surrendered on terms and he honoured his guarantee.

‘Abd al-Mu’min’s victory over the Ṣanhāja

After ‘Abd al-Mu’min had conquered Bougie, the Ṣanhāja gathered in multitudes that God alone could number, led by a man called Abū Qaṣba. They were also joined by Kutāma, Liwāta [160] and other tribes in great numbers. They planned to make war on ‘Abd al-Mu’min, who sent against them a large army, commanded by Abū Sa’īd Yakhlef, one of the ‘People of Fifty’. They met at the foot of the mountain east of Bougie. Abū Qaṣba fled and most of his followers were killed and their baggage plundered. Their womenfolk and their children were enslaved.

Having finished with the Ṣanhāja, they marched to the Castle of Banū Hammād, an extremely impregnable castle too high to be assailed on the top of a beetling mountain, where one’s eye could hardly make it out, so high it was. But when Fate decrees, no fortress and no army can withstand it. When the inhabitants saw the forces of the Almohads they fled away into the mountain tops and the castle was taken. All the money and other material that it contained were seized and taken to ‘Abd al-Mu’min who divided it up.

Account of the death of Sultan Mas‘ūd and the accession of Malikshāh [ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad]³

At the beginning of Rajab [began 2 October 1152] Sultan Mas‘ūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh died at Hamadhan, having been ill for about a week with a raging fever. He was born in the year 502 in the month of Dhū'l-Qa'da [June 1109]. With him died the fortunes of the Saljuq house. After him no banner of consequence nor any that was respected was raised to support it.

The death of Qays was not the death of one man,
But the edifice of a tribe was destroyed.⁴

The sultan (God have mercy on him) was of excellent character, full of mirth and easy-going with people. As an illustration of this, Atabeg Zankī, lord of Mosul,

³ Correct the rubric given in *Kāmil*.

⁴ This verse by ‘Abda ibn al-Ṭabīb is from an elegy on Qays ibn ‘Āsim (see al-Marzūqī, *Sharḥ dīwān al-Hamāsa*, 792).

sent him Cadi Kamāl al-Dīn [161] Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī on a mission. He arrived and stayed with him among the army. One day he waited at the vizier’s tent until near the time for the sunset call to prayer. He set out back to his own tent but the call to prayer was made as he was on his way. He caught sight of a man of legal learning in a tent and stopped there and prayed the sunset prayer with him. Later Kamāl al-Dīn asked him where he was from. He replied, ‘I am cadi of such-and-such a town.’ Kamāl al-Dīn said to him, ‘Cadis are three sorts. Two in Hell-fire and that means you and me; and one in Paradise, who is the one who has not known the doors of these tyrants and never set eyes on them.’ The next day the sultan sent to summon Kamāl al-Dīn. When the sultan saw him as he came into his presence, he laughed and said, ‘Cadis are three sorts?’ Kamāl al-Dīn said, ‘Yes, my lord.’ ‘By God, you speak truly,’ the sultan continued, ‘How fortunate are those that never see us and those we never see!’ He gave orders for his business to be completed and sent him back that very day.

He was generous and not greedy for the wealth of his subjects, towards whom he behaved well. As a ruler he was one of the best of sultans and the most gentle in character, easy in his manner and kind. For example, he passed one day along a certain street in Baghdad and heard a woman saying to another, ‘Come quickly and see the sultan.’ He halted and said, ‘Just until this lady comes and sees us.’ He possessed many virtues and manifold traits of excellence.

He had announced that his successor was to be Malikshāh, the son of his brother Sultan Mahmūd, so after his death Emir Khāss Beg ibn Balankirī proclaimed Malikshāh as sultan with the khutbah in his name and arranged affairs of state satisfactorily in his service. The whole army submitted in obedience to the new sultan.

When the news of the death of Sultan Mas‘ūd came to Baghdad, the prefect there, Mas‘ūd Bilāl, fled to Takrit. The Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh requisitioned his residence and those of the sultan’s men in Baghdad and took all they had in them. Every person who held any deposit belonging to any one of them brought it to the Dīwān. The caliph gathered retainers and troops, raising a large military force. He ordered that all wine in the houses of the sultan’s followers should be poured away. In the house of Mas‘ūd Bilāl, the prefect of Baghdad, a great amount of wine was found and poured away. People had not [162] thought that he drank wine after his pilgrimage. The poet al-Mu’ayyad al-Ulūsī and Ḥayṣa Bayṣa, also a poet, were arrested. The latter was subsequently released and what had been taken was restored to him.

Sultan Malikshāh sent Salārkurd with an army to al-Ḥilla. After his entry Mas‘ūd Bilāl, the Baghdad prefect, came to him and pretended to be acting with him. After they had met, Mas‘ūd Bilāl arrested and drowned him, seizing control of al-Ḥilla for himself. Hearing of this the caliph sent troops against him under Vizier ‘Awn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra. When they drew near to al-Ḥilla, Mas‘ūd Bilāl crossed the Euphrates and gave battle but was defeated by the caliph’s force. The people of al-Ḥilla proclaimed the watchword of the caliph so Mas‘ūd did not enter.

His defeat and that of his men became complete, and he returned to Takrit. After the caliph's army had taken al-Hilla, the vizier dispatched a force to Kufa and another to Wāsiṭ and they took both places.

Later the sultan's army came to Wāsiṭ, at which the caliph's force left. When this came to his hearing, the caliph himself took the field and set out from Baghdad for Wāsiṭ. Then the sultan's forces abandoned it and the caliph re-took it. From there he went to al-Hilla, then returned to Baghdad, arriving on 19 Dhū'l-Qa'da [15 February 1153]. He had been away twenty-five days.

In due course Khāṣṣ Beg ibn Balankirī seized Prince Malikshāh, whom he had proclaimed as sultan after Mas'ūd, and, when he was in Khūzistān, sent to his brother Prince Muḥammad in the year 548 [1153] asking him to come. His purpose was to arrest him when he came and to proclaim himself as sultan. Prince Muḥammad went to him and, after his arrival, was installed on the throne of the sultanate during the first days of Ṣafar [began 28 April 1153] and his name mentioned in the khutbah as sultan. Khāṣṣ Beg waited upon him with excessive attention and brought him splendid gifts of great value.

The day following his arrival he entered into the presence of Prince Muḥammad and was slain, as was Zankī al-Jāndār with him. Their heads were thrown away and their followers scattered. No two goats butted their heads together over this. [163] Aydughdī al-Turkomānī, known as Shumla,⁵ had been with Khāṣṣ Beg and had urged him not to visit Prince Muḥammad, but he took no notice and was killed. Shumla escaped, raided Muḥammad's horses at pasture and escaped, making for Khūzistān. Muḥammad took a great deal of the property of Khāṣṣ Beg and became firmly established as sultan. Khāṣṣ Beg's corpse remained where it lay until the dogs ate it. He was a Turkoman youth who became close to Sultan Mas'ūd and gained precedence over all the other emirs, but this was how his career ended.

Conflict between Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd and the Franks

In this year the Franks gathered together, mustering their horse and their foot. They marched against Nūr al-Dīn, when he was in Joscelin's lands, to prevent him from taking them over. They arrived when he was at Dulūk and as they came near him, he turned to meet them. A pitched battle took place between them at Dulūk and they fought the fiercest fight that had ever been seen. Both sides held firm but then the Franks broke and many of them were killed or captured. Nūr al-Dīn returned to Dulūk, took and occupied it.

⁵ Shumla (or Aydughdī ibn Kushdughān), a member of the Afshar tribe of the Oghuz, ruled Khuzistan as a Saljuq vassal from c.550/1155 till his death in 570/1174, see *EI*(2), i, 239–40; Bosworth, 'The Iranian World', 171–2.

Concerning this the following verses were composed:⁶

In this resplendent age of yours you have repeated
 The victories of the Prophet and their times.
 You have matched – how wonderfully! – their Uhuds
 And you have gladdened their Badrs with a Badr.⁷
 Their Emigrants were your Followers
 And the supporters of your project their Helpers (*Anṣār*).
 You have renewed the Islam of their Salmān
 And your success has restored their ‘Ammār.⁸
 The day at Inab was just like those [days];
 No, it surpassed their spans with its full reach.
 [164] You have crushed its ‘Urayma⁹ with a blow
 That dissolved its rocks with its water.
 At Tell Bāshir you faced them directly
 With an assault that scaled its walls,
 If Dulūk gave them a drubbing (*dālaka*?)
 You acted with severity and made its history come true. (?)

Account of the conflict between Sanjar and the Ghūr

In this year there was a conflict between Sultan Sanjar and the Ghūr. When their state first came to prominence,¹⁰ the first man to rule was called al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn, who acquired the mountains of Ghūr and the city of Firūzkūh, which is close to the region of Ghazna. He became powerful, taking the title ‘Alā’ al-Dīn, and caused trouble to some areas. Later he assembled a vast army and attacked Herat, putting it under siege. His troops plundered Nāb, Awba and Mārbād, in Herat’s territory, and al-Rūdh. He then went to Balkh and besieged it. Emir Qumāj with a body of Oghuz fought him but the Oghuz betrayed Qumāj and joined the Ghūr’s leader who then took Balkh.

Hearing of this Sultan Sanjar marched against him to stop his progress. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn stood firm to confront him but after a battle the Ghūr were defeated and ‘Alā’ al-Dīn captured. A great number of the Ghūr were slain, especially the foot soldiers. Sultan Sanjar had ‘Alā’ al-Dīn brought before him and asked him, ‘O Ḥusayn, if you had been victorious over me, what would you have done with me?’

⁶ The verses are by Ibn Munīr, *Dīwān*, 227–8.

⁷ A reference to Uhud and Badr, two battles of the Prophet with the pagan Meccans.

⁸ The references are to Salmān al-Fārisī and ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir, two notable Companions of the Prophet.

⁹ This is the reading of the *Dīwān*. *Kāmil* reads: ‘azīmataḥā (‘its resolve’).

¹⁰ For a general survey of Ghurid history, see Nizami, ‘The Ghurids’.

He produced a silver chain and said, 'I would have bound you with this and carried you to Firūzkūh.' Thereupon Sanjar bestowed a robe upon him and restored him to Firūzkūh, where he remained some time.

Later 'Alā' al-Dīn attacked Ghazna, where the ruler at that time was Bahrām Shāh [ibn Mas'ūd] ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mas'ūd ibn Maḥmūd ibn Sabuktakīn.¹¹ He did not stand firm there to meet 'Alā' al-Dīn but left for Kurramān,¹² a city between Ghazna and India, whose inhabitants are a people called the Afghans. This is not [165] the province known as Kerman. When Bahrām Shāh abandoned Ghazna, 'Alā' al-Dīn the Ghurid took it over, treated the people well and appointed over them his brother, Sayf al-Dīn Sūrī, whom he installed on the throne of government. The khutbah was made in his own name and his brother Sayf al-Dīn's after him.

'Alā' al-Dīn returned to the Ghūr lands and ordered his brother to bestow precious robes of honour on the notables and to give them splendid presents. This he did and treated them well. When winter came and snow had fallen and the people of Ghazna learnt that the road to them was blocked, they made contact with Bahrām Shāh, their former ruler, and summoned him back. He came to them with an army and when he was close to the city, the population rose up against Sayf al-Dīn and seized him without a fight. The Alids were the ones who carried out his capture. The men with him fled; some of them escaped and some were taken. They blackened Sayf al-Dīn's face, mounted him on a cow and paraded him around the city, before crucifying him. Verses were composed in mockery of him and even women sang them.

When this news reached 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Husayn, he recited some verses to this effect: If I do not sometime obliterate Ghazna, I am not al-Husayn ibn al-Husayn.' Later on Bahrām Shāh died and was succeeded by his son, Khusroshāh. 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Husayn made his preparations and marched to Ghazna in the year 550 [1155-6]. On receipt of this news Khusroshāh left to go to Lahore. 'Alā' al-Dīn took Ghazna and sacked it for three days. He seized the Alids who had captured his brother and threw them down from the tops of mountains. The quarter where his brother had been crucified he demolished and he arrested the women who were reported to have sung satirical songs about his brother and the Ghūr. He put them in a bathhouse and prevented them from leaving until they died there.

He remained in Ghazna until he had repaired it and then returned to Firūzkūh. He took with him [166] a great crowd of the people of Ghazna and made them carry baskets full of earth, with which he built a castle in Firūzkūh, which stands to this day. He took the title of 'Exalted Sultan' (*al-sultān al-mu'azzam*) and had the parasol carried according to the custom of the Saljuq sultans. Some of their history has been given under the year 543 [1148-9] and in some matters there is a discrepancy from what is given here. Everything we have either heard or read in

¹¹ Bahrām Shāh (c.510-52/1117-57); see *EI*(2), i, 940; ii, 1051.

¹² In *Kāmil K.r.mān*. The reading adopted (=Kurram in the North-West Frontier of modern Pakistan) is suggested by Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 114.

their writings and so we have recorded both versions. Al-Husayn remained thus for a while and appointed as his deputies his two nephews, Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Shihāb al-Dīn.

How Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Shihāb al-Dīn the Ghurids came to power

After their uncle ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Husayn ibn al-Husayn’s rise to power, he appointed officials and emirs throughout his lands. His two nephews, namely Ghiyāth al-Dīn Abū'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad ibn Sām and Shihāb al-Dīn Abū'l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad ibn Sām, were among those who were appointed governor, to a town in the Ghūr lands called Sanja.¹³ Ghiyāth al-Dīn at that time had the title Shams al-Dīn, while the other was entitled Shihāb al-Dīn.¹⁴ After their appointment they ruled well and justly in their area of authority. They were generous with money and the people inclined towards them. Their reputation spread. Someone who envied them carried damaging reports about them to their uncle ‘Alā’ al-Dīn and said, ‘They intend to surprise and kill you and seize power.’ Their uncle sent to demand their presence but they refused because news of what was going on had already reached them. After their refusal ‘Alā’ al-Dīn dispatched an army against them with a general called Kharwash al-Ghūrī. They met in battle and Kharwash and those with him were defeated. He himself was captured but the brothers spared him, treated him kindly and gave him robes of honour. They declared open rebellion against their uncle and stopped the khutbah in his name.

‘Alā’ al-Dīn in person moved against them and they marched towards him. They met and a fierce battle was fought in which ‘Alā’ al-Dīn was defeated and taken prisoner. His army was routed but his nephews made a proclamation of safe-conduct for his men. They brought their uncle to them, sat him on the throne [167] and waited upon his orders. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn wept and said, ‘These are two youths who have done what I would not have done, had I been in a position to do it.’ Their uncle immediately summoned the cadi and married Ghiyāth al-Dīn to a daughter of his and made him his heir apparent, which he continued to be until ‘Alā’ al-Dīn died.

After his death Ghiyāth al-Dīn succeeded and had the khutbah made in his own name as sovereign in Ghūr and Ghazna. This remained the situation until the Oghuz conquered Ghazna, for the death of ‘Alā’ al-Dīn fed their ambitions to take it. Ghazna remained in their hands for fifteen years, while they afflicted the inhabitants with torture and pursued oppressive ways, as was their practice in every town they conquered. After they took Ghazna, had they ruled their subjects well, their rule would have endured. The Oghuz lasted in Ghazna for this period,

¹³ ‘Sanga, the chief place in Mandēsh’, *EI*(2). ii, 1100b. Mandish located in eastern mountains of Ghūr, see Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, appendix A, p. 154.

¹⁴ Later changed to Mu'izz al-Dīn, the identification used in Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*.

while Ghiyāth al-Dīn was strengthening his position, ruling well and winning the hearts and the active support of the people.¹⁵

How Ghiyāth al-Dīn took Ghazna and the neighbouring lands

When Ghiyāth al-Dīn had grown powerful, he sent a mighty army under his brother Shihāb al-Dīn to Ghazna, which force contained various sorts of Ghūr, Khalaj¹⁶ and Khurasanians. The Oghuz met them in battle and the Ghūr fled the field but Shihāb al-Dīn remained firm while the Oghuz pursued the fugitives. With those who stood firm with him Shihāb al-Dīn turned to attack the Oghuz standard-bearer, slew him and took his standard but left it standing. The Oghuz began to return but they did not know what Shihāb al-Dīn had done. They arrived seeking their standard and as each group came he killed them, destroying most of them. He entered Ghazna and took it over,¹⁷ where he ruled the people well and spread justice.

[168] From Ghazna he went to Kurramān and Shinwarān¹⁸ and took them both. Then he went further towards ‘the waters of Sind’¹⁹ and made preparations to cross into India and attack Lahore. At that time Khusroshāh ibn Bahram Shāh, whose father we have mentioned before, was there. When Khusroshāh heard of this, he marched with his men to ‘the waters of Sind’ and opposed his crossing. Therefore Shihāb al-Dīn withdrew and attacked Peshawar which he took and also the nearby Indian uplands and the Afghan regions.²⁰ God knows best!

The account of Shihāb al-Dīn’s conquest of Lahore

After Shihāb al-Dīn had taken the Indian uplands, his power and his personal prestige grew and great was the awe felt for him in people’s hearts, while they loved him for his good rule. When winter had passed and spring came in the year 579 [1183-4], he marched to Lahore with a great host and numerous levies from

¹⁵ See Nizami, ‘The Ghurids,’ 181-2.

¹⁶ The Khalaj were ‘a nomadic people in the *garmsīr* (‘hot’) regions of Bust and Zamīndāwar, who may have been of Turkish stock but would in time become assimilated to the neighbouring Afghans,’ Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*, 11; and see *EI*(2), iv, 917-18).

¹⁷ According to Juzjānī this was in 569/1173-4 (Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 125).

¹⁸ *Kāmil* again has K.r.mān. Shinwarān (*Kāmil*: Sh.n.w.rān) is taken from the suggestion that the toponym is ‘reminiscent of the present-day Shinwari tribe of Afghans, whose tribal territories lie to the south-east of the Khyber Pass in the direction of the Kurram river valley’ (Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 125).

¹⁹ Presumably the Indus River.

²⁰ Probably the mountainous region straddling the present Afghan-Pakistan border between the Khyber and the Gumal Passes.

Khurasan, Ghūr and elsewhere. He crossed over to Lahore and put it under siege. He sent to the ruler, Khusroshāh,²¹ and the inhabitants with threats if they resisted and informed them that he would not leave until he had taken the city. Khusroshāh was offered a guarantee for himself, his family and his property and also whatever grant of land he would like and also that Shihāb al-Dīn would give his daughter in marriage to Khusroshāh's son on condition that he came to do obeisance and made the khutbah in the name of Shihāb al-Dīn's brother. He refused, however, so Shihāb al-Dīn continued to besiege him and press him hard. When the population and the troops saw this, their willingness to support their lord dwindled and they deserted him. Seeing this he sent the city's cadi and preacher to seek terms for himself. Shihāb al-Dīn agreed and swore oaths to him. He then left the city and the Ghūr entered it. For two months he continued to be given honoured treatment by Shihāb al-Dīn. Then a messenger arrived from Ghiyāth al-Dīn for Shihāb al-Dīn, ordering him to send Khusroshāh to him.

[169] Account of the end of the dynasty of Sabuktakīn

When Ghiyāth al-Dīn sent to his brother Shihāb al-Dīn asking him to send him Khusroshāh,²² Shihāb al-Dīn ordered the latter to prepare for the journey and depart. He said, 'I do not know your brother. I have only ever talked with you and have received no oath except for what you have given.'²³ He calmed him and put his mind at rest, before sending him on his way, accompanied by his son. An army went with them to guard them both. They left unwillingly. When they reached Peshawar, the people came out to meet them, weeping and calling down blessings on them. Their guards drove them off, saying, 'One sultan is paying a visit to another. Why are you weeping?' They beat them and they withdrew. The son of the local preacher went out to Khusroshāh on behalf of his father to bring a complaint to him. He said, 'When I came before him, I told him of my father's message and I said, "He has resigned from the position of preacher and has no desire to serve anyone but you." He said to me, "Greet him for me," and he gave me a gown²⁴ of Indian cotton and a prayer-mat (*muṣallā*) of Sufi make. He said, "This was a keepsake of my father's from his father. Give it to him and tell him, "Bend with the times, however much they change." He recited eloquently:

²¹ By the year 579/1183–4 Khusroshāh had died and had been succeeded by his son Khusromalik who ruled until 582/1186. Ibn al-Athīr's account is confused as to names and dates. He alludes to his uncertainties (below p. [170]) and himself mentions the death of Khusroshāh *sub anno* 555/1160. See Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 123.

²² Cf. previous note.

²³ Literally 'is on your neck.'

²⁴ In Arabic *farajiyā*. In Dozy, *Supplément*, ii, 248: 'robe flottante, faite ordinairement de drap, à manches amples et longues qui dépassent un peu l'extrémité des doigts, et qui ne sont point fendues.'

It is not like the old days of the encampment, O Umm Mālik;
Rather have chains encompassed our necks.²⁵

I returned to my father and told him what had occurred. He wept and said, “The man is convinced he is going to perish.” Then they departed and when they arrived at the lands of the Ghūr, Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not meet with them but gave orders for them to be taken up into a certain castle. This was the last that was heard of them.’

He was the last ruler of the family of Sabuktakīn.²⁶ Their dynasty began in the year 366 [976-7] and their rule lasted for approximately 213 years. Their rulers were among the best of princes for conduct of government, especially his ancestor, Maḥmūd, for his exploits in Jihad are well-known and his good deeds to gain the life to come are celebrated.

Were any family to sit above the sun in nobility,
Through the first of them and their glory they would do so.

[170] Blessed be He whose kingdom does not pass away and who is unchanged by the ages! Out on this despicable life here below! Consider how it treats its sons. We pray God Almighty to take the veil from our hearts so that we may see this world with the eye of truth, that He may turn our thoughts to Him and fill our minds to the exclusion of all else. ‘He is over every thing mighty.’²⁷

This is the account of a certain scholar of Khurasan,²⁸ that Khusroshāh was the last of the rulers of Sabuktakīn’s family. However, another has recorded that he died while in power and that his son Malikshāh succeeded him. We shall mention this under the year 559 [1163-4]. Altogether there is some dispute, as I see it, about the beginning of the dynasty of the Ghurids. If the truth should ever come to light, then I shall correct it, God willing.

How Ghiyāth al-Dīn was proclaimed as sultan in the khutbah

When their sovereignty was established in Lahore, their kingdom had expanded and their troops and wealth become numerous, Ghiyāth al-Dīn wrote to his brother Shihāb al-Dīn about instituting the khutbah in his own name as sultan and adopting the honorific titles of sultans. His own title had been Shams al-Dīn and he now

²⁵ Verse by Abū Khirāsh al-Hudhalī, one of the Hudhaylī poets, who died in the caliphate of ‘Umar (634-44 AD). See *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 292-3.

²⁶ i.e. the Ghaznavid dynasty, whose founder was Maḥmūd, son of Sabuktakīn (see *EI*(2), ii, 1050).

²⁷ Koran, xli, 39.

²⁸ This probably refers either to Ibn Funduq (d. 565/1169) or to his presumed continuator. See below s.a. 568, p. [380].

styled himself Ghiyāth al-Dīn wa'l-Dunyā Mu'īn al-Islām Qasīm Amīr al-Mu'minīn.²⁹ He gave the title Mu'izz al-Dīn to his brother, Shihāb al-Dīn, who carried out his orders and proclaimed his name in the khutbah as sultan.

Account of Ghiyāth al-Dīn's conquest of Herat and other places in Khurasan

After Shihāb al-Dīn had finished his reorganization and reordering of Lahore, he travelled to his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn. When they met, they agreed to march to Khurasan and attack [171] and besiege the city of Herat. They set out with large forces, descended upon the town, where there was a body of Sanjar's Turks, and put it under siege. They pressed hard on the defenders, who sought to surrender the town, sending a request for terms. The two rulers accepted this, granted them terms and took over the town. They expelled the emirs of Sanjar who were there and Ghiyāth al-Dīn appointed as his lieutenant there Kharnak³⁰ al-Ghūrī.

Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his brother went to Būshanj³¹ and took it, then to Bādghīs, Kālīn and Baywār, which they also conquered. All of this Ghiyāth al-Dīn took over and ruled the inhabitants well. He returned to Fīrūzkūh, while Shihāb al-Dīn returned to Ghazna. Properly speaking these events of Ghurid history should be mentioned under the various years. We have lumped them together to give a continuous narrative and because it included matter for which no date was known, so we have left it as we found it.

How Shihāb al-Dīn took the city of Agra in India

When Shihāb al-Dīn returned to Ghazna from Nishapur, he remained until he and his army had rested and recuperated, then marched into India and besieged the city of Agra, the seat of an Indian king, but he could achieve nothing against him. This Indian had a wife who dominated his affairs. Shihāb al-Dīn wrote proposing that he marry her. She replied to say that she was not suitable for him but that she had a daughter [172] who was beautiful and whom she would give to him in marriage. He sent agreeing to the marriage with the daughter. Thereupon she gave her husband poison. He died and she delivered the city to Shihāb al-Dīn.

Having taken over the city, he took the girl and, after her conversion to Islam, married her and bore her to Ghazna. He granted her abundant pensions, entrusted her to people to teach her the Koran but neglected her. Her mother died and then ten years later she too died. He had not seen her nor approached her. He built a shrine for her, where she was buried and the people of Ghazna visit her tomb.

²⁹ i.e. Succour of Religion and of Worldly Affairs, Helper of Islam, Partner of the Commander of the Faithful.

³⁰ *Kāmil* has Khaznak, but Juzjānī gives Kharnak, e.g. *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, 343, 381.

³¹ Sometimes Fūshanj, as in the text. Cf. *EI*(2), i, 1342-3.

He later returned to India, where its difficulties were overcome by him and he succeeded in conquering a large amount of the country. He humbled their kings and achieved more against them than any Muslim ruler had ever done before.

Account of the Hindus' victory over the Muslims

When Shihāb al-Dīn had caused serious depredation in the land of the Hindus and much slaughter among its population and had gained power there, the rulers gathered together, held discussions and criticized one another. They came to the opinion that they should unite and cooperate to wage war on him, so they assembled and raised their armies. The Hindus flocked to them from every nook and cranny on every variety of mount,³² arriving with all sorts of weapons. The person who controlled all the princes that gathered together was a woman, one of the greatest of their rulers.

When Shihāb al-Dīn heard of their gathering and their march towards him, he also moved against them with a large force of Ghūr, Khalaj, Khurasanians and others. They met and battle was joined but there was not much fighting before the Muslims broke and the Hindus rode them down, killing and taking prisoners, causing great losses. Shihāb al-Dīn received a blow which disabled his left arm and another on his head which brought him to the ground. Night separated the two sides. Shihāb al-Dīn became aware in the darkness of the night of a group of his Turkish mamlukes, who were seeking him amongst the corpses and weeping. [173] The Hindus had already retired. He called to them, despite what he was suffering, and they hurried to him. They carried him away on their shoulders, on foot and taking it in turns to carry him, until they arrived at the city of Agra with the dawn.

News that he was safe spread amongst his people and they arrived from all quarters to congratulate him. The first thing he did was to take the Ghūr emirs who had fled and abandoned him, fill their horses' nosebags with barley and swear that if they did not eat it he would cut off their heads, so of necessity they ate it. The news also reached his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn, who wrote to him, blaming him for his hastiness and rashness, and sent him a large army.³³

Account of the Muslim victory over the Hindus

After Shihāb al-Dīn's escape and return to Agra and the arrival of reinforcements from his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn, the Hindus returned, having renewed their armament and augmented their host with replacements for those who had been

³² In the text 'on the refractory and the docile', the opposites expressing comprehensiveness.

³³ An account of this Ghurid defeat is given s.a. 583/1187-8, pp. [561-2].

killed. With their queen they came in numbers that choked the plains. Shihāb al-Dīn made contact with her, trying to trick her with an offer of marriage, but she did not agree to that. She said, ‘Either give battle or give up India and return to Ghazna.’ He answered her that he would return to Ghazna but that he would ask permission of his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn. This was done as a deceitful ruse.

There was a river between the two armies and the Hindus guarded the fords, so that none of the Muslims could cross. The latter remained in expectation of the reply that would come from Ghiyāth al-Dīn, or so they pretended. While this was the situation, a Hindu came to Shihāb al-Dīn and informed him that he knew of a ford close to the Hindus’ army and asked him to send a force with him which he would lead across the ford [174] to catch the Hindus unawares and unprepared. Shihāb al-Dīn feared that this might be a cunning trap but the man provided guarantees from the people of Agra and Multan, so Shihāb al-Dīn sent a sizeable force with him, in command of which he put Emir al-Ḥusayn ibn Kharmīl al-Ghūrī. He was later to become lord of Herat and was highly regarded for his valour and his good sense.

The force left with the Hindu and forded the river. Before the Hindus were aware of what was happening the Muslims were amongst them and putting them to the sword. Those guarding the [other] fords were distracted, so Shihāb al-Dīn and the rest of his army crossed the river and surrounded the Hindus, many of whom they killed. They shouted the watchword of Islam and the only Hindus that escaped were those whom the Muslims were unable to kill or take captive. Their queen was slain and after this battle Shihāb al-Dīn’s control of India became firm and he was safe from any contagion of revolt. They undertook to pay tribute and gave hostages, so he made peace with them. To his mamluke Qutb al-Dīn Aybak he assigned Delhi, which was the capital of the lands he had conquered, and then he sent an army of Khalaj with Muḥammad ibn Bakhtiyār, which took parts of India that no Muslim had ever previously reached, so that eastwards he came close to the borders of China.

A merchant friend of mine told me of two battles which are similar to the two we have mentioned, but there are some discrepancies. We have given an account of them under the year 588 [1192–93].³⁴

[175] Miscellaneous events

During this year Ya’qūb the Secretary died in Baghdad, who had been a resident in the Niẓāmiyya Madrasah.³⁵ The administrator of estates came and sealed the room which he occupied in the madrasah. The law students rioted and beat the official.

³⁴ In fact, s.a. 588 only an account of the victorious campaign is given, see below pp. [91–3].

³⁵ In *Muntażam*, x, 146–7 and 152, he is called al-Khaṭṭāṭ, ‘the Calligrapher.’ He died in the Hospice of Bahrūz during Jumādā II/September 1152.

They took the property left, as was their practice with anyone who died there with no heir. The palace chamberlain arrested two of the lawyers and tortured and imprisoned them. The lawyers then closed the madrasah and threw the preacher's chair into the street; they climbed onto the madrasah's roof at night and called for support, abandoning proper behaviour. At this time their professor was Shaykh Abū'l-Najib. He came and prostrated himself below al-Tāj³⁶ to apologize. He was pardoned.

This year the following died:

Husām al-Dīn Timurtāsh, lord of Mardin and Mayyafariqin. He ruled for thirty odd years and was succeeded by his son Najm al-Dīn Alpī.

Abū'l-Fadl Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn Yūsuf al-Armawī al-Shāfi'i, the Ḥadīth scholar. He was born in the year 459 [1066-67].³⁷

Abū'l-As'ad 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Qushayrī in Shawwāl [January 1153]. He was the chief shaykh of Khurasan.

In Muḥarram of this year [April 1152] in Baghdad a cockerel laid an egg, a [male] falcon laid two eggs and an ostrich without any mate also laid an egg.

³⁶ For this palace (meaning 'the Crown'), see Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 260-61.

³⁷ Died in Rajab/October 1152 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 149).

Account of Sanjar's defeat at the hands of the Oghuz and their plundering of Khurasan and what followed

In Muḥarram of this year [April 1153] Sultan Sanjar was defeated by the Oghuz Turks, a group of Turks who were Muslim and formerly lived in Transoxania.

When the Khitay came to rule, the Oghuz were expelled from Transoxania, as we have narrated, and they came to Khurasan in great numbers. They dwelt in the regions of Balkh, exploiting its pasture-lands. They had emirs, one of whom was called Dīnār and others Bakhtiyār, Tūtī, Arslān, Chaghri and Maḥmūd. The Emir Qumāj, who was fief holder of Balkh, wanted to remove them, but they made an arrangement with him in return for their offering him something, so he backed down. They continued to behave very well, causing no harm to anyone, performing the set prayers and paying their alms tax.

Then Qumāj interferred with them again and ordered them to migrate from the area. They refused and united one with another. Other groups of Turks joined with them. Qumāj moved against them with 10,000 cavalry. Their emirs came to him and requested him to desist and leave them in their pastures and they would give him 200 silver dirhams for every household, but he did not allow this and pressured them further to move away from his land. After retiring and gathering their men, they fought him. Qumāj was defeated and his and his men's property plundered. Many in the army and the local population were killed [177] and the women and children enslaved. Every sort of enormity was committed; scholars of the law were slain and madrasahs destroyed.

Qumāj's rout took him all the way to Marv, where Sultan Sanjar was. Informed of the situation, Sanjar wrote threatening them and ordered them to leave his lands. They apologized and offered him much to overlook their actions and leave them in their pastures. Refusing to accept this, Sanjar gathered his forces from all quarters of his realm, until more than 100,000 cavalry had joined him. He then marched against them and a fierce battle took place. Sanjar's troops were defeated and he himself fled. The Oghuz pursued them, killing and taking prisoners. Those slain from among the army were piled up like mounds. 'Alā' al-Dīn Qumāj was killed and Sultan Sanjar captured, along with several of his emirs. The emirs were beheaded but as for Sultan Sanjar, the Oghuz emirs assembled and kissed the ground before him. They said, 'We are your slaves and will not cast off allegiance to you. We know that you did not wish to fight us but were only persuaded to do so. You are the sultan and we are your slaves.' Two or three months passed and they took him into Marv, the capital of Khurasan. Bakhtiyār asked him for Marv as a fief but the sultan replied, 'This is the capital. It is impossible for it to be

anyone's fief.' They laughed at him and Bakhtiyār made a rude noise with his mouth. When he saw this, Sanjar stepped down from the throne, entered the sufi hospice of Marv and renounced his rulership.

The Oghuz took over the lands and practised unheard-of tyranny. They appointed a governor over Nishapur, who imposed large levies on the population and used them with harshness and violence. He suspended three sacks in the markets and said, 'I want these filled with gold.' The common folk rose up and killed him and his men, so the Oghuz rode into Nishapur and sacked it mercilessly, and made it a wasteland. [178] They killed young and old and burnt the corpses. They killed the cadis and ulema throughout the land, including al-Husayn ibn Muḥammad al-Arsābandī, the Cadi 'Alī ibn Mas'ūd and the Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā. The poets wrote many elegies for Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā, amongst which are the verses of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm the Secretary:

Gone is he from whose mouth were pearls gathered,
Whose stream flowed with learning and with goodness.
Gone is Ibn Yaḥyā who was a life-bringing cloud
For Abr-shahr¹ and a lamp for its darkness.
Empty of learning and piety now is Khurasan
Since his mourner announced his death to the world.
When they slew him, religion died. Woe is me,
Who will revive [yuḥyī] it now that Muhyī al-Dīn is no more?

It is impossible to describe what all these regions suffered at their hands. No part of Khurasan escaped the plunder of the Oghuz apart from Herat and Dihistan, because they were well protected and they held out.²

A certain historian³ of Khurasan told some of their history with greater clarity. According to his account these Oghuz were a people of the remotest Turks who migrated from the furthest regions into Transoxania during the reign of al-Mahdī. They converted to Islam and al-Muqanna',⁴ the 'miracle-worker' and mountebank, called on them for help for the success of his mission. When the armies moved against him, these Oghuz abandoned him and gave him up. This has been their practice in every state they have lived under. They acted in a similar way with the Qarakhanid rulers. However, the Qarluq Turks subdued them and drove them from their homelands. Then Emir Zankī ibn Khalīfa al-Shaybānī, who controlled the frontier area of Tukhāristān, summoned them and settled them in his lands.

¹ i.e. 'cloud-town', an old name for Nishapur.

² For an account of Sultan Sanjar's struggle with the Oghuz tribesmen and his defeat, see Bosworth, 'The Iranian World,' 151-7.

³ This was probably Ibn Funduq al-Bayhaqī (died 565/1169) in his lost *Mashārib al-tajārib*. See *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 145.

⁴ i.e. the veiled one, the nickname for a heterodox rebel against the Abbasid caliph al-Mahdī (reigned 158-69/775-85); see *EI*(2), vii, 500.

Between him and Emir Qumāj there was an enmity which with time only grew greater because the two of them lived as neighbours. Each one wished to surpass and dominate the other. [179] The Oghuz added to Zankī's power. They accompanied him to Balkh to wage war on Qumāj, but the latter made contact with them with the result that they turned to him and deserted Zankī when fighting began. Zankī and his son were made captive and Qumāj killed the son and began to feed his flesh to his father, whom he also later killed. Qumāj assigned various places to the Oghuz as fiefs and allowed them the freedom of his land's pasturages.

When al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī arose in Ghazna and attacked Balkh, Qumāj and his troops, along with the Oghuz, marched out to meet him. The Oghuz deserted him and joined with the Ghurid, so that he took Balkh. Sultan Sanjar marched on Balkh and the Ghurid abandoned it after a battle in which he was defeated. He later submitted to Sultan Sanjar because he was too weak to stand against him and was reinstated in Ghazna.

The Oghuz remained in the region of Ṭukhāristān, while Qumāj harboured a rage against them because of the way they had treated him. He planned to drive them from his land. They gathered their forces and various groups of Turks joined them. Arslān Būqā the Turk was made their leader. Qumāj also gathered his army and met them in a battle which lasted a whole day until nightfall. Qumāj and his troops were defeated and he and his son Abū Bakr were taken prisoner and both killed. The Oghuz took over the districts of Balkh, where they rampaged and caused havoc, plundering, killing and despoiling.

Hearing this news, Sultan Sanjar mobilized and marched against them. They sent envoys to him with apologies and excuses, but he did not accept their pleas. The sultan's advance guard, led by Muḥammad, son of Abū Bakr and grandson of the slain Qumāj, and al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba, came up with them in Muḥarram of the year 548 [29 March–27 April 1153]. Sultan Sanjar arrived after them and the Oghuz confronted him, having sent apologies and offers of money, obedience and willingness to do whatever he ordered, none of which Sanjar accepted. He moved against them and they met in a stubborn battle. The fighting lasted a long time but finally Sanjar's army fled and he too. They made their way to Balkh in a most wretched [180] state, pursued by the Oghuz. They fought a second battle and again Sultan Sanjar was defeated and fled towards Marv in Ṣafar of this year [28 April–26 May 1153]. The Oghuz also set out in that direction. When the Khurasanian army heard of their approach, they panicked and fled because fear of them and terror had entered their hearts. When the sultan and the troops with him left Marv, the Oghuz entered and sacked it most atrociously and horribly. This was in Jumādā I [25 July–23 August 1153]. Many of the populace and the notables were slain, including Chief Cadi al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Arsābandī and Cadi 'Alī ibn Mas'ūd and other leading ulema.

After he had left Marv, Sanjar made for Andarāba⁵ but the Oghuz captured him.

⁵ Krawulsky, 65–6: once a city in Afghanistan. There is now an Andarāb valley where Bam is.

They sat him on the throne of the sultanate in his normal fashion, stood before him and offered him allegiance. Then they renewed their raiding of Marv in Rajab [22 September–21 October 1153] The inhabitants resisted and fought them with their best efforts and all their strength but they became exhausted, so surrendered to them. The Oghuz then plundered the city worse than the first time and left nothing there.

All the emirs of Khurasan and his vizier, Tāhir ibn Fakhr al-Mulk ibn Nizām al-Mulk, had abandoned Sanjar, so that only a small band of his body-servants and eunuchs remained with him. When the others reached Nishapur, they summoned Prince Sulaymān Shāh, son of Sultan Muḥammad, who came to Nishapur on 19 Jumādā II [11 September 1153]. They met before him and proclaimed him sultan. In this same month a detachment of the royal army moved against a large body of Oghuz, whom they defeated soundly, killing many of them. The survivors fled to their Oghuz emirs and joined with them.

After the troops had gathered with Prince Sulaymān Shāh, they went to Marv, seeking the Oghuz, who took the field against them. The moment the Khurasanian army saw them, they broke and turned [181] in flight, making for Nishapur. The Oghuz pursued them and passed Ṭūs, the birth-place of ulema and ascetics, which they plundered, enslaving the women, killing the men and destroying mosques and houses. In the whole province of Ṭūs only the town where the shrine of ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā is located and a few other places with walls survived.

Among the notables killed were the local imam Muḥammad al-Mārishi, the syndic of the Alids there ‘Alī al-Mūsāwī, the Preacher Ismā‘il ibn al-Muhsin and the Chief Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad. Any righteous shaykhs there they did away with. From there they went to Nishapur, arriving in Shawwāl 549 [9 December 1154–6 January 1155], and found there no one to defend and protect it. They sacked it devastatingly, killed the inhabitants and kept on until they imagined that they had spared nobody. In two quarters 15,000 dead men were counted, apart from women and children. The women and children they enslaved and seized all the property. The corpses remained in the streets in mounds, on top of one another. Most of the populace gathered in the al-Manī‘ī Mosque and barricaded themselves in. The Oghuz surrounded them and the citizens were unable to resist. The Oghuz broke in and killed them to the last man. They would demand money from a person and if he gave his money to them, they [still] killed him. They slew many ulema and divines, among them being Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā, the Shāfi‘ī lawyer, with whom there was no one comparable in his time. People journeyed to visit him from the extreme east and west. Many ulema wrote elegies for him, including Abū'l-Hasan ‘Alī ibn Abī'l-Qāsim al-Bayhaqī,⁶ who wrote:

O shedder of a learned scholar's blood,
Whose repute has flown into the furthest realms,

⁶ This is the writer otherwise known as Ibn Funduq.

By God, tell me, O wicked one, and do not fear,
One who was giving life to religion, how could you kill him?

Other victims were the ascetic, ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Akkāf, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn [182] the secretary, grandson of al-Qushayrī, Abū'l-Barakāt al-Furāwī, Imam ‘Alī al-Šabbāgh, the theologian, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥāmid, ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Mulqābādhī, the Cadi Ṣā’id ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Ṣā’id, al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Rāzī and a host of imams, ascetics and men of piety. The Oghuz also set fire to the libraries there and only one or two of them survived.

They then besieged the Shahristan,⁷ which was well-protected. They surrounded it but the inhabitants resisted them, manning the wall. They then proceeded to plunder Juwayn.⁸ The people of Bahrābād in the district of Juwayn fought them, offered their lives for God and defended their homeland, but the rest were overwhelmed, plundered and killed. They moved on to Isfarā’īn, which they sacked and destroyed, killing great numbers of the population. Among the slain was ‘Abd al-Rashīd al-Ash‘athī, who had been a leading man in the sultan’s state, which he rejected to concentrate on advanced religious learning and the search for the rewards of the world to come.

Having finished with Juwayn and Isfarā’īn, the Oghuz returned to Nishapur and plundered whatever remained after the first sacking. Many of its population had taken refuge in the Shahristan. The Oghuz now beset and overwhelmed them, seizing what belonged both to its inhabitants and the people from Nishapur. They despoiled women and children and perpetrated things that [even] infidels had not done to Muslims. The urban gangs were also plundering Nishapur worse than the Oghuz and doing uglier things than they.

Prince Sulaymān Shāh’s position weakened. He was a wicked ruler and a bad administrator. In addition, his vizier, Tāhir ibn Fakhr al-Mulk ibn Niẓām al-Mulk, had died in Shawwāl 548 [20 December 1153–17 January 1154] which weakened his position. To follow him he appointed his son as vizier, Niẓām al-Mulk Abū [183] ‘Alī al-Ḥasan ibn Tāhir. His government collapsed completely and he left Khurasan in Ṣafar 549 [17 April–5 May 1154] and returned to Jurjan. The emirs met together and wrote to the Khān Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Bughrākhān, the son of Sultan Sanjar’s sister.⁹ They made the khutbah in his name on the minbars

⁷ i.e. the walled Inner City, see Bulliet, *Patricians*, 7 and 77.

⁸ The district of Juwayn is in the far west of the province of Khurasan. Bahrābād is a settlement on the Jajarm–Nishapur road (see Krawulsky, 71, 88).

⁹ Maḥmūd was one of the Turkish Qarakhanids. See Soucek, *Inner Asia*, 83–4: ‘The Qarakhanids ruled a confederation of tribes living in Semireche, westernmost Tianshan (roughly identical with much of present-day Kyrgyzstan), and western Sinkiang (Kashgaria). The ... tribes of Qarluq, Yaghma and Chigil are believed to have been the core of this confederation.’ For the accession of Maḥmūd at Samarcand in 524/1130, see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), pp. [661–2].

of Khurasan and invited him to come to them. They gave him dominion over their affairs and submitted to him in Shawwāl 549 [9 December 1154–6 January 1155]. Along with him they marched against the Oghuz who were besieging Herat. There were various battles between them in most of which the Oghuz were victorious. However, they raised the siege of Herat in Jumādā I 550 [July 1155] and returned to Marv, where they renewed their extortion of the population.

The Khāqān Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad went to Nishapur, but al-Mu'ayyad had already taken control of it, as we shall relate. He made overtures of peace to the Oghuz and in Rajab 550 [September 1155] they concluded a tactical truce.¹⁰ We shall narrate the rest of the history of the Oghuz under the year 552 [1157–8].

How al-Mu'ayyad took Nishapur and elsewhere

Sultan Sanjar had a mamluke whose name was Ay-Aba and who had been dubbed al-Mu'ayyad.¹¹ When all this disturbance took place, he became prominent and important. Many emirs gave him their obedience and he took control of Nishapur, Tūs, Nasā, Abīward, Shahristan and Dāmghān, driving the Oghuz out of all these places and killing many of them. He ruled well, gave justice to the people and won their favour. He also reduced the land tax for those liable and was fully considerate of the members of established houses. The country was well under his control and his subjects were obedient because of his good government. His standing grew and his troops became numerous. The Khāqān Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad contacted him about surrendering his lands and attending at court. This was rejected. To and fro went [184] their envoys, until al-Mu'ayyad agreed to pay a tribute to Prince Maḥmūd, who then left him alone. He and Prince Maḥmūd remained in the lands they held.

The account of Īnānj's taking of Rayy

Īnānj was one of Sultan Sanjar's mamlukes. When the Oghuz caused the turmoil that we have mentioned, he fled from Khurasan and came to Rayy, which he seized and made his residence. To Sultan Muḥammad Shāh ibn Maḥmūd, lord of Hamadhan, Isfahan and elsewhere, he sent a dutiful message and gifts to win his goodwill and made a show of obedience to him. He remained in Rayy until the death of Sultan Muḥammad¹² and then he took full control of it and of several

¹⁰ The phrase *hudna 'alā dakhan* is glossed in dictionaries as 'a peace [made] for a reason, not for reconciliation'.

¹¹ i.e. 'the one supported [by God]'.

¹² The text has 'Maḥmūd' incorrectly. *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 122 has 'Muḥammad'. He died in 554/1159.

towns in the neighbourhood of Rayy. His position and his standing became very great and his army grew to 10,000 cavalry.

When Sulaymān Shāh took Hamadhan, as we shall relate, Īnānj came to him and offered him allegiance because of his friendship with him that dated from the days of Sulaymān Shāh's residence in Khurasan.

How Ibn al-Sallār, al-Zāfir's vizier, was killed and 'Abbās became vizier

In Muḥarram of this year [April 1153] the vizier of al-Zāfir bi-Allāh, al-'Ādil ibn al-Sallār, was killed. He was killed by his stepson, 'Abbās ibn Abī'l-Futūḥ ibn Yaḥyā al-Şanhājī, who was advised to do that by Emir Usāma ibn Munqidh with the agreement of the Caliph al-Zāfir bi-Allāh. 'Abbās gave the order to his son, Naṣr, who came to al-'Ādil, while he was with Naṣr's own grandmother, Umm 'Abbās, and killed him. He was followed as vizier by his stepson 'Abbās.¹³

[185] 'Abbās had come to Egypt from the Maghrib, as we have mentioned. He learnt tailoring and was a good tailor. Ibn Sallār who married his mother, became fond of him and raised him well but 'Abbās repaid him by murdering and succeeding him.

In Egypt the vizierate was the prize of whoever was the strongest. The caliphs were kept behind the veil and the viziers were the *de facto* rulers. Since al-Afḍal it was rare for anyone to come to office except by fighting and killing and similar means. This is why we have written of the viziers under [their own] individual rubrics.

The conflict between the Arabs and the troops of 'Abd al-Mu'min

In Şafar of this year [April 1153] there was a battle between the army of 'Abd al-Mu'min and the Arabs at the city of Sétif.

This came about because, when 'Abd al-Mu'min conquered the lands of the Banū Ḥammād, the Arabs, that is the Banū Hilāl, Athbaj, 'Adī, Riyāḥ, Zughb and other tribes, met together from Tripoli to the furthest Maghrib and said, 'If 'Abd al-Mu'min becomes our neighbour, he will expel us from the Maghrib. We have no option but to exert all our efforts against him and drive him out of the country before he becomes entrenched.' They all swore to cooperate and give mutual support and that they would not betray one another. They determined to meet him with their men, their families and possessions to fight to the last.¹⁴

News of this came to King Roger the Frank, lord of Sicily, who sent to the emirs

¹³ For the murder of al-'Ādil (Thursday 6 Muḥarram/= 2 April 1153) and 'Abbās's vizierate, see Usāma ibn Munqidh, *Memoirs*, 42–4.

¹⁴ Literally 'to fight the fight for their womenfolk'.

of the Arabs, namely Muhriz ibn Ziyād, Jubāra ibn Kāmil, Ḥasan ibn Tha‘lab, ‘Īsā [186] ibn Ḥasan and others, urging them to confront ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn and proposing to send them 5,000 Frankish knights to fight with them, on condition that they send him hostages. They thanked him but said, ‘We do not need your help. We only seek aid from Muslims.’ They set out in numbers beyond counting.

‘Abd al-Mu’mīn had departed from Bougie for the Maghrib. When he heard the news, he despatched an army of Almohads numbering more than 30,000 horse and gave the command to ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar al-Hintātī and Sa’d Allāh ibn Yaḥyā. The Arabs outnumbered them many times but the Almohads enticed them forward and the Arabs followed them until they arrived at the region of Sétif among the mountains. ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn’s troops then attacked them and caught the Arabs unprepared. The two sides met in a very fierce and terrible battle. The engagement ended with the defeat of the Arabs and victory for the Almohads.¹⁵

The Arabs abandoned all they had, families, goods, utensils and flocks and the Almohads seized everything. The army returned to ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn with all the booty which he divided among the troops. He left the women and children under guard and put them in the charge of eunuch servants who served them and looked after their needs, ordering them to be well protected. When they arrived with him at Marrakech, he lodged them in spacious houses and supplied them with generous funds. He ordered his son Muḥammad to write to the Arab emirs to tell them that their women and children were under guard and protected and to order them to come so that his father could hand everything back. He added that they were offered guarantees of security and honourable treatment.

When Muḥammad’s letter came to the Arabs, they hastened to set out for Marrakech. Upon their arrival ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn gave them their women and children, treated them well and gave them large sums of money. Thereby he captivated their hearts, they stayed with him and were welcomed by him. He sought their help to establish his son Muḥammad as his heir, as we shall relate under the year 551 [1156-7].

[187] Account of the Franks’ capture of Bône, the death of Roger and the accession of his son William

This year the fleet of Roger, the king of the Franks in Sicily, went to Bône. Their commander was his eunuch Philip of Mahdiyya, who besieged it and sought the aid of the Arabs against it. He took it in Rajab [22 September-21 October 1153] and enslaved the population and seized everything there, except that he turned a blind eye to a number of ulema and divines who were thus able to leave with their

¹⁵ See Idris, *La Berbérie*, 371-4, for other details of this uprising. The battle took place on Thursday 1 Šafar 548/= 30 April 1153.

families and possessions to go to the local villages. He stayed in Bône for ten days and then returned to Mahdiyya with some captives. He then went back to Sicily where Roger imprisoned him because of his lenient treatment of the Muslims in Bône.

Philip, of whom it was said that he and indeed all Roger's eunuchs were Muslims, concealed that fact. However, testimony was given that he did not fast with the king and that he was a Muslim, so Roger assembled the bishops, priests and knights who judged that he should be burnt. This was done in Ramaḍān [20 November–19 December 1153]. This was the first calamity that befell the Muslims in Sicily.¹⁶ Nevertheless God only allowed Roger a little time after that before he died in the first third of Dhū'l-Ḥijja of this year [late February 1154]. His illness was diphtheria and he was near eighty years old.¹⁷ He had reigned for about sixty years. After his death he was succeeded by his son William who was a corrupt administrator and a man of evil designs. He appointed Māyū al-Burṣānī¹⁸ as his minister, who proved a bad administrator. Some castles on the island of Sicily and in Calabria disputed his position and the contagion spread to Ifrīqiya, as we shall relate.

[188] The death of Bahrām Shāh, ruler of Ghazna

In Rajab [22 September–21 October 1153] Sultan Bahrām Shāh ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Maḥmūd ibn Sabuktakīn, lord of Ghazna, died there. His son, Nizām al-Dīn Khusroshāh, succeeded him. Bahrām Shāh ruled for thirty-one years. He was just, a good ruler, a man of excellent conduct, who loved and honoured the ulema, bestowing on them large amounts of money. He used to collect books to be read in his presence and their contents expounded. When he died, his son Khusroshāh became ruler.

How the Franks took Ascalon

During this year the Franks in Syria took the city of Ascalon, which was part of the realm of al-Zāfir bi-Allāh, the Egyptian Alid. The Franks had been attacking and harassing it every year without finding any way to take it. In Egypt the viziers had authority in the country, while the caliphs beside them held nominal power with no substance. Every year the viziers used to send stores, weapons and money to Ascalon and men to maintain its defence. In the present year Ibn al-Sallār the vizier was killed, as we have mentioned. Aims and purposes were all at odds in

¹⁶ The fate of Philip of Mahdiyya is discussed in Norwich, *Kingdom in the Sun*, 157–60.

¹⁷ Roger II died on 26 February 1154 at the age of fifty-eight (Idris, *La Berbérie*, 376).

¹⁸ i.e. the admiral, Maio of Bari.

Egypt. ‘Abbās became vizier and before there was any settled authority the Franks took advantage of the neglect of Ascalon, gathered their forces and put it under siege. The inhabitants held firm and fought fiercely, some days even fighting outside the city wall. They repulsed the Franks and drove them defeated back to their tents, pursuing them all the way. At that stage the Franks despaired of taking the city.

While they were deciding to withdraw, they received news that a dispute had broken out between [189] the inhabitants and that there had been people killed, so they stayed where they were. The reason for this dissension was that, when they returned from the battle with the Franks, victorious and triumphant, one party claimed that victory had come from them and that they were the ones who had repulsed and defeated the Franks. Their argument grew serious until there was a fatality on one side. Then a serious crisis arose and the evil became grave. A battle ensued and men were killed. The Franks seized their chance and made an assault. They met no resistance and conquered the city.¹⁹

Account of the caliphal army's siege of Takrit and its withdrawal

This year the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh sent an army to besiege Takrit. With them he sent as commanders Abū'l-Badr, the son of Vizier ‘Awn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra, and Turshuk, one of the caliph's close staff, and others. A rivalry arose between Abū'l-Badr and Turshuk, which obliged the vizier's son to write, complaining of Turshuk. The caliph ordered him to arrest Turshuk, who learnt of this and made contact with Mas‘ūd Bilāl, lord of Takrit. He came to terms with him and arrested the vizier's son and the other commanders who were with him. He handed them over to Mas‘ūd Bilāl. The [caliph's] army fled and many were drowned. Mas‘ūd Bilāl and Turshuk moved out of Takrit to the Khurasan Road, which they plundered and destroyed. Al-Muqtafī marched from Baghdad to drive them away. They fled at his approach. The caliph made for Takrit and besieged it for several days. The inhabitants fought him from behind the city wall and several men in his army were killed by arrows, so the caliph withdrew without having taken it.

[190] Miscellaneous events

This year ships came from Sicily with a force of Franks. They sacked the city of Tinnis in Egypt.

During this year there was a pitched battle and fierce fighting between the

¹⁹ Ibn Qal., 321-2, gives no date. See Stevenson, *Crusaders*, 171, note 3, for a review of the sources, which point to late August 1153.

Georgians in Armenia and Şaltuq, lord of Erzerum. Şaltuq was defeated, taken prisoner by the Georgians but then released.²⁰

The following died this year:

Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn Abī Ghālib, the book-seller, known as Ibn al-Talāya, the Baghdad ascetic. He was a pious man, who transmitted both Ḥadīth and belles-lettres.²¹

'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sahl, Abū'l-Faṭḥ ibn Abī'l-Qāsim al-Karūkhī al-Harawī, the transmitter of *The Collection* of al-Tirmidhī.²² He was born in the year 462 [1069–70] and died in Baghdad in Dhū'l-Ḥijja [17 February–17 March 1154].²³

²⁰ Correct text's Şalıq. The Şaltuqids were a Turkoman dynasty centred on Erzerum circa 465–598/1072–1202; see *EI*(2), viii, 1001, s.v. Şaltuq Oghulları. The Georgians under Dimitri I captured 'Izz al-Dīn Şaltuq ibn 'Alī near Ānī in 1154 AD; he was later ransomed.

²¹ He was born after 460/1067–8 and died Monday 11 Ramaḍān/30 November 1153 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 153).

²² For Tirmidhī (died c.275/888), see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, ii, 773–4. His Ḥadīth collection is normally called *al-Sunan*.

²³ *Muntaẓam*, x, 154–5, says that he died in Mecca and that he made his living as a copyist.

Account of the killing of al-Zāfir and the caliphate of his son al-Fā'iz

In Muḥarram of this year [April 1154] al-Zāfir bi-Allāh Abū al-Manṣūr Ismā'īl, son of al-Ḥāfiẓ li-Dīn Allāh ‘Abd al-Majīd, the Alid, ruler of Egypt, was killed. This came about as follows. His vizier ‘Abbās had a son called Naṣr, whom al-Zāfir loved and made one of his favourite intimate courtiers, from whom he was unable to be parted for a single hour. It came about that Emir Mu’ayyad al-Dawla Usāma ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī came from Syria during the vizierate of Ibn al-Sallār. He became close to ‘Abbās and encouraged him to kill al-‘Ādil ibn al-Sallār, his mother’s husband. This he did and al-Zāfir appointed him vizier. Having achieved that office, he proceeded to monopolize power.

The amirs and the soldiers learnt that this was Ibn Munqidh’s doing and so planned to kill him. In a private meeting with ‘Abbās, he said to him, ‘How can you endure the evil scandal that I am hearing?’ ‘What is that?’ he asked. ‘People assert that al-Zāfir is sodomizing your son Naṣr.’ Naṣr was particularly close to al-Zāfir and kept company with him day and night. He was also extremely handsome and al-Zāfir’s relationship with him was suspect. ‘Abbās was annoyed and outraged and asked, ‘What is to be done?’ ‘You should kill him and then your shame will go away’ was the reply. ‘Abbās told his son Naṣr of the situation and they both agreed to kill him.

It is said that al-Zāfir had assigned Naṣr ibn ‘Abbās the village of Qalyūb, one of the largest villages [192] of Egypt. Mu’ayyad al-Dawla ibn Munqidh came to him when he was with his father ‘Abbās and Naṣr said to him, ‘Our lord has granted me the village of Qalyūb.’ Mu’ayyad al-Dawla said, ‘That’s not very much for your dowry!’ He, along with his father, was outraged and refused to put up with this situation. He undertook to kill al-Zāfir at his father’s suggestion. Naṣr came to al-Zāfir and said, ‘I would like you to come to my house for a feast I have prepared. Do not bring lots of attendants.’ At night with a small group of servants he accompanied Naṣr on foot. When he entered the house, he and those with him were murdered. A young page hid where he was not seen and escaped. The corpses were buried in the house and Naṣr informed his father¹ ‘Abbās.

Early in the morning ‘Abbās went to the palace and asked the eunuchs who especially waited upon al-Zāfir to seek permission for him to have an audience because of some matter he wished to consult him about. They said, ‘He is not in the palace,’ to which he replied, ‘He must be.’ His aim was to divert suspicion from himself for the murder and to execute [as suspects] those in the palace who he

¹ In error *Kāmil* has ‘his brother’.

feared would dispute his choice of successor to the caliphate. When he pressed them, they were unable to produce the caliph.

While they were seeking him, distraught and bewildered, not knowing what had happened, the young page who had witnessed the murder came in. He had fled from ‘Abbās’s house when nobody was looking. He told them of al-Zāfir’s murder, so they went to ‘Abbās and said to him, ‘Ask your son about him. He knows where he is because they went out together.’ When he heard that, he said, ‘I want to search the palace just in case one of his family might have assassinated him.’ He examined every corner of the palace and executed two brothers of al-Zāfir, Yūsuf and Jibrīl. He enthroned al-Fā’iz bi-Naṣr Allāh Abū'l-Qāsim ‘Īsā ibn al-Zāfir bi-Amr Allāh Ismā‘il the day after his father was murdered, who was then five years old. ‘Abbās carried him on his shoulders, sat him on the throne and the people gave him their oaths of allegiance. From the palace ‘Abbās took all the money, jewels and precious objects that he wanted. He left only what had no value.²

[193] Al-Ṣāliḥ Ṭalā'i‘ ibn Ruzzik becomes vizier

The reason for the appointment of al-Ṣāliḥ Ṭalā'i‘ ibn Ruzzik was that ‘Abbās, after he had killed al-Zāfir and set up al-Fā’iz, thought that matters had successfully fallen out for him just as he wanted, but in fact the situation was the opposite of what he believed. Opposition to him was expressed and the army and the black troops rose against him. It came about that, when he gave an order, no attention was paid to him and his words were ignored. The women and eunuchs in the palace sent to al-Ṣāliḥ Ṭalā'i‘ ibn Ruzzik to plead for his help and enclosed locks of their hair in their letters. He was in Minyat Ibn Khaṣib, acting as governor there and in the local district. It was not an important district but just the nearest to them and he was a man of action. He gathered his men to tackle ‘Abbās and set out. When ‘Abbās heard this news, he left Egypt to go to Syria with his treasure that he had which was beyond counting and the luxury objects and things without parallel that he had taken from the palace. After he had set out, the Franks caught and killed him and seized all he had with him which added to their strength.³

Al-Ṣāliḥ arrived and made his entry into Cairo with black banners and black garments in mourning for al-Zāfir and with the locks that had been sent from the palace on lance points. This was a remarkable augury, for fifteen years later the black banners of the Abbasids entered Cairo and did away with the Alid banners.

After al-Ṣāliḥ had entered Cairo he was invested with the vizierial robe of office and established in authority. He summoned the page who had witnessed al-Zāfir’s murder and he pointed out the place where he was buried. Al-Ṣāliḥ exhumed him and transferred him to the Fatimid cemetery in the palace.

² For an account of these events from a person directly involved, see Usāma ibn Munqidh, *Memoirs*, 44–7.

³ Cf. the detailed narrative in Usāma ibn Munqidh, *Memoirs*, 47–53.

When the Franks killed ‘Abbās, they took his son prisoner. Al-Şāliḥ sent to the Franks and gave them money for his person. He travelled from Syria with al-Şāliḥ’s men and did not speak a word to any of them until he saw Cairo, when he recited:

[194] Yes, we were once living there but
Accidents of fate and stumbling chance destroyed us.

He was taken into the palace and this was the last of him, because he was killed and his body exhibited on the Zuwayla Gate. Al-Şāliḥ harassed the houses of the great and the notables in Egypt, destroyed their households and drove them from their dwellings, appropriating their wealth. Some of them perished and some were scattered to the Hijaz, Yemen or elsewhere. He did this for fear that they would rebel against him and dispute the vizierate with him. [Usāma] ibn Munqidh had fled with ‘Abbās and, when the latter was killed, had fled to Syria.

Account of the siege of Takrit and the battle of Bakimzā

During this year the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh sent an envoy to the governor of Takrit on account of the captives they held, that is the vizier’s son and others. The envoy was arrested, so the caliph sent an army, which was met and fought by the people of Takrit and prevented from entering the town. At the beginning of Ṣafar [17 April 1154] the caliph took the field in person and besieged the town. The inhabitants fled, so the troops made their entry, caused disturbances and sacked a part. Thirteen trebuchets were set up to attack the citadel and a tower on the wall collapsed. The siege continued until 25 Rabī‘ I [9 June 1154].

The caliph then ordered a full assault. The fighting intensified and many were killed but nothing was achieved, so he departed to return to Baghdad, which he entered at the end of the month [14 June]. The Vizier ‘Awn [195] al-Dīn ibn Hubayra was ordered to resume the siege, prepare what was needed and collect more siege engines. He set out on 7 Rabī‘ II [21 June] and put it under a tight blockade. However, news came that Mas‘ūd Bilāl had come to Shahrābān,⁴ accompanied by Alpqush Kūn Khar and Turshuk with a large force and had plundered the country, so the vizier returned to Baghdad.

The reason why the force had arrived was that they had urged Prince Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, to attack Iraq but he was unable to do so. However, he sent this force to which a large host of Turkomans attached themselves. The caliph moved to meet them. Mas‘ūd Bilāl sent to Takrit and took away Prince Arslān, son of Sultan Ṭughril ibn Muḥammad, who was imprisoned in Takrit, saying, ‘This is our sultan. We shall fight for him against the caliph.’

⁴ Krawulsky, 504–5: ‘a town in the district of Ba’qūbā, modern-day Miqdādiyya.’ See also Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 62.

The two armies met at Bakimzā⁵ near Ba'qūbā. The skirmishing and the combats lasted eighteen days, but at the end of Rajab [10 October 1154] they clashed in a full-scale battle. The caliph's right wing and part of the centre were broken and fled back to Baghdad. The caliph's stores were plundered and his treasurer killed. He along with the heir apparent charged in person, crying out 'Onward the Hashemites! Give the lie to the Devil,' and reciting 'God has turned back the unbelievers in their wrath; they gained no benefit.'⁶ The rest of the army then charged with him and Mas'ūd Bilāl, Alpqush and all with them were routed. Their defeat was complete and the caliph was victorious. His troops took all the property of the Turkomans as booty, their mounts, flocks and such like. A ram was sold for a *dāniq*.⁷ They had also brought their womenfolk, children, their tents and all their goods. All was seized. A proclamation was made: 'Anyone who has taken any of the Turkomans' children or women, let him give them back.' This was done. Alpqush Kūn Khar took Prince Arslān and fled to the district of al-Lihf and the castle of Māhkī.

[196] During this conflict the Banū 'Awf treacherously withdrew from the caliph's army and joined the 'Ajāmīs. Hindī the Kurd also went with them. Prince Muḥammad had sent a force with Khāṣṣ Beg ibn Āqsunqur to reinforce Kūn Khar. When they reached al-Rādhān the news of the defeat came to them, so they retired. The caliph went back to Baghdad and entered in the early days of Sha'bān [began 11 October 1154]. He received intelligence that Mas'ūd Bilāl and Turshuk had attacked Wāsiṭ and sacked and destroyed it. The caliph despatched the Vizier Ibn Hubayra with an army on 5 Sha'bān [15 October]. The 'Ajāmīs fled but were met by the caliph's army which took a good deal of booty from them, before returning to Baghdad. The vizier was given the title 'Sultan of Iraq, Prince of the Armies.'

The caliph sent another army to the territory of al-Lihf, which he captured and appropriated. As for Prince Alp Arslān ibn Ṭughril, Alpqush took him with him to his lands and Prince Muḥammad sent to him, asking for his presence along with Arslān. However, Alpqush Kūn Khar died during Ramaḍān this year [9 November–8 December 1154] and Arslān remained with Alpqush's son and Ḥasan al-Jāndār, who took him to the Uplands. Prince Muḥammad feared that Arslān would come to his stepfather İldikiz, who would make him a pretext for attacking his lands. All his caution was of no avail. Arslān did make contact with İldikiz, his stepfather, and joined forces with him. Arslān was the brother of Pahlawān ibn İldikiz on his mother's side. Ṭughril, who was killed by Khwārazm Shāh, was the son of this Arslān and the last of the Saljuqs.

⁵ In Yāqūt, i, 706: Bakimzā, 'a village about two leagues from Ba'qūbā.' This battle is expressly mentioned. Cf. Yāqūt, i, 497, s.v. Bajimzā (variant: Bakimzā). *Muntazam*, x, 156, has 'at the river of Bakimzā.'

⁶ Koran, xxxiii, 25.

⁷ i.e. a sixth of a dirham.

[197] Account of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd's conquest of Damascus

In Şafar of this year [April 1154]⁸ Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur took the city of Damascus from its ruler, Muṣir al-Dīn Abaq ibn Muḥammad ibn Būrī ibn Ṭughtakīn the Atabeg. The reason for his efforts to conquer it was that, when the Franks took the city of Ascalon in the previous year, Nūr al-Dīn had no route to hinder their attack because Damascus was an obstacle between him and Ascalon. After the Franks gained Ascalon they became eager to dominate Damascus. They even reviewed every local Christian slave or slave girl in the city and those who wanted to stay there but any who wanted to return to their home they took away by force, whether the owner was willing or not. The Franks had an annual tribute which they took from the population. Their agents used to enter the city and collect it from the people.

When Nūr al-Dīn saw this, he feared that the Franks would take full possession and then the Muslims would have no base left in Syria. He employed guile to take the city since he knew that it could not be taken by force because, whenever its ruler thought that he was about to be overcome, he made contact with the Franks and sought their assistance; and they gave assistance to prevent its falling into the hands of someone who would use its resources to fight them. So Nūr al-Dīn wrote to its ruler Muṣir al-Dīn, won him over with a series of gifts and declared his friendship for him, so that he came to trust him. On some occasions Nūr al-Dīn used to say, 'Such and such a person (meaning one of Muṣir al-Dīn's emirs) has written to me about surrendering Damascus.' The person about whom the comment was made would be banished and his fief confiscated. When none of his emirs remained with Muṣir al-Dīn, he promoted an emir called 'Aṭā ibn Ḥaffāz al-Sulamī, the eunuch,⁹ who was resolute and brave, and entrusted him with all the affairs of state. With him there Nūr al-Dīn was unable [198] to gain Damascus. However, Muṣir al-Dīn arrested and executed him.¹⁰ Thereupon Nūr al-Dīn marched to Damascus, having already corresponded with the local militia and won their support. They promised to deliver the city to him. When Nūr al-Dīn besieged the city, Muṣir al-Dīn sent to the Franks, offering money and the cession of Baalbek castle if they would aid him and raise Nūr al-Dīn's siege. They began to gather their cavalry and infantry to make Nūr al-Dīn withdraw but, before they had got together what they wanted, Nūr al-Dīn had taken over the city and they returned 'with great cry and little wool'.¹¹

⁸ *Bāhir*, 107, has 10 Şafar/26 April 1154.

⁹ 'Aṭā al-Khādim, who had been governor of Baalbek, was made viceroy in Damascus in 547/1152-3 (Ibn Qal., 321).

¹⁰ In Dhū'l-Qa'da 548/January 1154 'Aṭā was arrested for corrupt and high-handed administration and was executed on Monday 25 Dhū'l-Hijja/ 15 February 1154 (Ibn Qal., 326).

¹¹ The original Arabic is *bi-khuffay Hunayn* ('with Hunayn's two boots'). The narrative behind the proverb is set out in Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v. *khuff*.

As for the way Damascus surrendered, when he put it under siege, the militia with whom he had made contact, rose up and gave him access to the city by the East Gate. He secured the city and blockaded Mujīr al-Dīn in the citadel. He proposed that he give it up and offered him a fief that included the city of Homs. He accepted and left for Homs but later wrote to the Damascenes suggesting that they reinstate him. Learning of this, Nūr al-Dīn became anxious and took Homs from him, giving him Bālis instead. He was not satisfied with this, however, and went away to Iraq. He took up residence in Baghdad and built himself a house there near to the Niẓāmiyya.

How the Ismā‘īlīs attacked Khurasan and how they were overcome

In Rabī‘ II of this year [15 June–13 July 1154] a large body of Ismā‘īlīs from Quhistan gathered together, their numbers reaching 7,000 men, both mounted- and foot-soldiers, and set out for Khurasan because the troops there were distracted by the Oghuz. They attacked the district of Khwāf¹² and the neighbouring lands. Emir Farrukhshāh ibn Maḥmūd al-Kāsānī with a band of his retainers and men met them but he knew that he did not have the strength to deal with them, so he left them and withdrew. He sent to Emir [199] Muḥammad ibn Unur, one of the greatest and bravest of the emirs of Khurasan, to inform him of the situation and ask him to come to them with his troops and any emirs he could bring so that they could cooperate to wage war on the Ismā‘īlīs.

Muḥammad ibn Unur set out with several emirs and many soldiers. They met with Farrukhshāh and faced the Ismā‘īlīs in a battle, which lasted a long time. God gave victory to the Muslims and the Ismā‘īlīs were routed. Many of them were killed, as the sword came upon them from every side. Their notables and leaders were finished; some were killed and others made prisoner. Only the rare fugitive survived. Their castles and forts were denuded of defenders. Were the armies not fully occupied with the Oghuz, they would have conquered them with no effort and trouble and rid the Muslims of the Ismā‘īlīs. However, God has a purpose which He will achieve.¹³

The account of Nūr al-Dīn’s taking of Tell Bāshir

In this year or the next Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī took the citadel of Tell Bāshir,¹⁴ which is north of Aleppo, one of the strongest of fortresses. This came

¹² A province in Khurasan, whose main cities were Zūzan, Sanjān and Salāma (see Krawulsky, 94).

¹³ An allusion to Koran, lxv, 3.

¹⁴ According to *EI*(2), x, 167, Joscelin II lost Tell Bāshir (Turbessel) to Nūr al-Dīn in 546/1151. However, a year earlier the Byzantines had taken over. Ibn Qalānisi’s text as

about because, when the Franks saw that Nūr al-Dīn had taken Damascus, they became fearful of him and knew that he was too strong for them and that they would be unable to get him to divide revenues, because of their experience with him before his taking over Damascus. The Franks in Tell Bāshir made contact with him and offered to surrender it. He sent them Emir Ḥassān al-Manbijī, one of his senior emirs, whose fief at that time was the city of Manbij, which was close to Tell Bāshir. He ordered him to go there and receive its surrender, which he duly did. He fortified it and took up into it stores sufficient for many years.

[200] Miscellaneous events

The following died this year:

The major-domo, Abū'l-Futūḥ 'Abd Allāh ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Muzaffar, son of Ra'īs al-Ru'asā'. He used to give alms, do many good works and patronize the canon lawyers. After his death the caliph appointed his oldest son, 'Aḍud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh, to the offices his father had held.

'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Abd al-Şamad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, Abū'l-Qāsim al-Akkāf al-Nīsābūrī. He was a pious ascetic, a lawyer and an expert on law school differences. Sultan Sanjar used to visit him and seek the blessing of his prayers. Sometimes he would keep Sanjar out and not allow him to visit him.¹⁵

Thiqat al-Dawla Abū'l-Hasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Duwaynī. He used to be in the service of Aḥmad ibn al-Faraj al-Ibarī, who brought him up. He was even known as 'son of al-Ibarī,' and was given his daughter Shuhda *al-Kātiba*¹⁶ in marriage. Al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh showed him favour and made him his agent. He built a madrasah at the Azaj Gate.¹⁷

quoted in *Rawdatayn*, i, 267, says that Nūr al-Dīn's deputy, Emir Ḥassān al-Manbijī, took the place (*tasallum*) on terms. Correct Ibn Qal. 315, which has Ḥassān 'surrendering' (*taslim*), but gives a precise date for Nūr al-Dīn's hearing the news, i.e. Thursday 25 Rabi' I 546/12 July 1151.

¹⁵ Nevertheless, Sanjar interceded for him when the conquering Oghuz seized him at Nishapur and intended to torture him (*Muntażam*, x, 159).

¹⁶ This lady, known for her piety, died in 574/1178-9 almost 100 years old (see below). 'She lived in contact with the court and the learned.' The description *al-kātiba* ('the writer') refers to her reputation as a calligrapher. See *Wāfi*, xvi, 190-92.

¹⁷ He was a blacksmith (*ḥaddād*), favoured and advanced by al-Muqtafī. He died in Shā'bān/11 October-8 November 1155 (*Muntażam*, x, 160).

In this year the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh went to Daqūqā, put it under siege and fought the defenders. He then withdrew because he heard that the army of Mosul had mobilized to march to protect it from him. He left without having achieved anything.

This year Shumla the Turkoman took control of Khuzistan. He had assembled a large body of Turkomans and marched towards Khuzistan. The ruler at the time was Malikshāh ibn Muḥammad, to whom the caliph sent an army. Shumla confronted them in battle during Rajab [September 1155] and the caliph's force was defeated and its leaders taken prisoner. They were treated well and released. Shumla sent his excuses which were accepted. However, he went on to Khuzistan which he took and removed Malikshāh, the son of Sultan Muḥammad.

The Oghuz attacked Nishapur this year and took it by force. They entered the city and killed Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā, the Shāfi‘ī lawyer and about 30,000 others. Sanjar was still nominally sultan but he was confined and ignored, so much so that on many days he wished to go riding but had nobody to carry his weapon, so he fastened it at his waist and rode out. Whenever food was presented to him he would put some of it aside to eat another day, fearing that it might be withheld from him because they were so remiss in treating him as was due and because 'his due' was not something that they recognized.

This year the Armenian priests rebelled in the city of Ānī and took it from Emir Shaddād [202] and gave it over to his brother Faḍlūn.¹

During Dhū'l-Hijja [26 January-23 February 1156] the Qarluq Turks killed Ṭamghāj Khān² ibn Muḥammad in Transoxania and abandoned his body in the desert. They attributed wicked deeds to him. During his rule he had been weak and not respected.

This year there died Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Nāṣir ibn ‘Alī al-Baghdādī, the Koran scholar and literateur. Renowned for his learning, he was a Shāfi‘ī who became an extreme Ḥanbalī. He was born in Sha'bān 467 [April 1075] and his death also fell in Sha'bān [this year] [October 1155].³

¹ They were members of the Shaddadid dynasty of Arran and eastern Armenia, which began in Dvin circa 340/951; see *EI*(2), ix, 169-70. Fakhr al-Dīn Shaddād ibn Maḥmūd of the minor branch at Ānī was replaced by Faḍlūn IV who ruled until 556/1161; see Minorsky, *Studies*, 86-9 and genealogical tree, p. 106.

² Ṭamghāj Khān Ibrāhīm III (ruled 1141-56) was ruler of the western branch of the Qarakhanids (see Davidovich, 'The Karakhanids,' 132).

³ He was Ibn al-Jawzī's main teacher of Ḥadīth. He was born the eve of Saturday 25 Sha'bān 467/= 14 April 1075, and died Tuesday 18 Sha'bān/= 18 October 1150 (*Muntazam*, x, 162-3).

In Dhū'l-Hijja [26 January–23 February 1156] in Iraq and the neighbouring lands there was a great earthquake.

The following also died this year:

Yaḥyā al-Ghassānī, the grammarian from Mosul, who was a learned and good man.

Tāj al-Dīn Abū Ṭāhir Yaḥyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī, the cadi of Jazīrat ibn ‘Umar.

Account of the rebellion of the islands and Ifrīqiya against the Frankish king in Sicily and what the sequel was

Under the year 548 [1153-4] we have mentioned the death of Roger, king of Sicily, and the accession of his son William and that the latter was a wicked ruler, so that several Sicilian fortresses rebelled against his authority.

In this present year our people had hopes of throwing off his rule, so the islands of Jerba and Kerkenna rebelled and openly resisted his authority. The inhabitants of Ifrīqiya also rose against him. The first to defy him openly was ‘Umar ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Furrāyānī in Sfax. When Roger had conquered it, he had made his father, Abū'l-Hasan, who was one of the pious ulema, governor there but he was manifestly incompetent and weak. He said, ‘Appoint my son,’ which Roger did and took the father as a hostage to Sicily.

When he was about to go to Sicily, he said to his son ‘Umar, ‘I am old and my end is near. When the right opportunity enables you to rebel against the enemy, then do so. Do not worry about them nor consider that I may be killed. Count me as already dead.’ So when he found this opportunity, he called the citizens to revolt and said, ‘Let some of you climb on the walls and others attack the houses of all the Franks and the local Christians and kill every one.’ They said to him, ‘Our lord [204] the Shaykh, your father – we fear for him.’ ‘He himself ordered me to do this,’ he replied. ‘If thousands of the enemy are killed at the cost of the Shaykh, then he has not died.’ Before the sun rose they had slain the Franks to the last man. This took place at the beginning of the year 551 [began 25 February 1156].

Abū Muḥammad ibn Maṭrūḥ followed his lead in Tripoli and Muḥammad ibn Rushayd followed both of them in Gabès. The troops of ‘Abd al-Mu’min came to Bône and took it. Thus all of Ifrīqiya passed from the control of the Franks, except for Mahdiyya and Susa. ‘Umar ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan sent to Zawīla, a city separated by a sort of arena from Mahdiyya,¹ and encouraged them to attack the Christians there, which they did. The Arabs of the region came to Zawīla and helped the inhabitants against the Franks in Mahdiyya, cutting off all supplies.

When the news reached William, king of Sicily, he summoned Abū'l-Ḥasan and told him what his son had done. He ordered him to write to him, forbidding this action, commanding his return to allegiance and warning him of the fearful result of what he was doing. He replied, ‘Anyone who has embarked on such action will

¹ Mahdiyya was on a peninsula at the base of which was the discrete town of Zawīla. The two were separated by an isthmus, compared here to a *maydān* (open public place, hippodrome) about 80 metres in length (see Lézine, *Mahdiyya*, 23).

not turn back on the basis of a letter.' The king sent an envoy to him with threats and orders to abandon his course. 'Umar did not allow him to enter the city that day and on the following day all the inhabitants came out carrying a coffin, while the envoy watched. They buried it and returned. 'Umar sent to the envoy to say, 'This is my father I have buried and I have held a session of condolence for him. Do with him what you will.' The envoy went back to William and told him what 'Umar ibn Abi'l-Hasan had done, so William took his father and crucified him. He continued to call upon God Almighty until he died.

[205] The people of Zawīla gathered in a large host with the Arabs, the people of Sfax and others. They put Mahdiyya under a close siege. Provisions were scarce there and the ruler of Sicily sent them twenty galleys with men, food and armaments. Having entered the city, they sent to the Arabs, offering them money to retire. The next day they made a sortie and fought the men of Zawīla. The Arabs then deserted the field and the men of Zawīla and Sfax were left fighting the Franks outside the city. The Franks surrounded them and the men of Sfax fled, put out to sea and escaped. The men of Zawīla who were left were charged by the Franks and retreated towards Zawīla, whose gates they found closed. They turned to fight below the walls and held firm until most of them were slain. Only a few survived and they scattered. Some made their way to 'Abd al-Mu'min.

After this slaughter the women, children and old men who were there fled to the countryside, without thought for any of their property. The Franks entered Zawīla and killed any women and infants they found there and seized property as booty. The Franks were established in Mahdiyya until 'Abd al-Mu'min took it from them, as we shall relate, God willing.

The arrest of Sulaymān Shāh and his imprisonment at Mosul

During this year Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī Kūchuk, the deputy of Qutb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur, lord of Mosul, arrested Prince Sulaymān Shāh, son of Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh. Sulaymān Shāh had formerly been with his uncle, Sultan Sanjar, who had made him heir apparent and put his name in the khutbah on the pulpits of Khurasan. After Sanjar had endured from the Oghuz what we have already recounted and Sulaymān Shāh taken command of the Khurasan army, although they proved too weak to deal with the Oghuz, Sulaymān Shāh went to [206] Khwārazm Shāh, who married him to the daughter of his brother Aqsīs. Later Khwārazm Shāh heard reports about him that displeased him, so he sent him away. Sulaymān Shāh came to Isfahan but the prefect refused him entry. He then went to Qāshān but Muḥammad Shāh, the son of his brother Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad, sent a force which drove him away. He went to Khuzistan but Malikshāh repelled him. Finally he made for al-Lihf and stopped at Bandanījīn. He sent an envoy to Caliph al-Muqtāfi to tell him of his arrival. Messages went to and

fro until it was agreed that he should send his wife to be a hostage. He duly sent her to Baghdad, accompanied by many slave-girls and attendants and said, 'I sent these as hostages. If the Commander of the Faithful allows me to enter Baghdad, I shall do so but otherwise I shall go away.'

The caliph received his wife and those with her honourably and allowed Sulaymān Shāh to come to him. He came with a small force amounting to 300 men. The son of Vizier Ibn Hubayra went out to meet him with the chief cadi and the two syndics. The vizier's son did not dismount on meeting him. He entered Baghdad with a parasol borne over his head and the caliph gave him a robe of honour. Sulaymān Shāh remained in Baghdad until Muḥarram 551 [March 1156],² when he was summoned to the Caliphal Palace, as were the chief cadi, the notaries and the notables of the Abbasid family. He made an oath to the caliph to be loyal and obedient, to maintain his allegiance and that he would not cause any trouble to Iraq under any circumstance.

After his oath the khutbah in Baghdad was said in his name, he was given the titulature of his father, Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa'l-Dīn and the rest of it, and was invested with the sultanian robes. Three thousand cavalry from the Baghdad army were seconded to him and Emir Quwaydān, lord of Ḥilla, was appointed as his emir-chamberlain. He marched off to the Uplands in Rabī' I [24 April-23 May 1156]. The caliph went to Ḥulwān and sent to Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd and brother of Sultan Muḥammad, the lord of Hamadhan and elsewhere, calling him to joint action. Accordingly he came with 2,000 cavalry and each swore oaths to the other. Malikshāh was made heir apparent of [207] Sulaymān Shāh. The caliph supported both with money, weapons and other things. They continued their progress, joined with Īldikiz and grew to a great host.

When Sultan Muḥammad heard news of them, he sent to Qutb al-Dīn Mawdūd, lord of Mosul, and his deputy Zayn al-Dīn, seeking their help and support and offering them great rewards, if he should be victorious. They accepted this and made an agreement. Muḥammad's morale was strengthened and he marched to meet Sulaymān Shāh and the troops who had gathered under him. They fought a battle in Jumādā I [22 June-21 July 1156] and the fighting was fierce between the two sides. Sulaymān Shāh and his men were defeated and his army dispersed. Of the caliph's force, which was 3,000 strong, about fifty men returned [to Baghdad]. Not one was killed. Just their mounts and their possessions were taken and they were scattered and returned in dribs and drabs.

Sulaymān Shāh left Īldikiz and went towards Baghdad by way of Shahrazūr. He was intercepted by Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī with a company of the Mosul army. In Shahrazūr there was Emir Buzān, who held it as a fief from Zayn al-Dīn. When Zayn al-Dīn set out he chanced upon Sulaymān Shāh's route and took him prisoner. He carried him to the Mosul citadel³ and kept him there in honoured and

² Until Friday 15 Muḥarram/= 9 March 1151 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 164).

³ In Ramaḍān/18 October-16 November 1156 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 165).

respected captivity, until there happened to him what we shall mention under the year 555 [1160–61], God willing. After his arrest of Sulaymān Shāh, Zayn al-Dīn sent to inform Sultan Muḥammad⁴ of this and promised him support for whatever he had in mind to do with him.

[208] How Nūr al-Dīn besieged the castle of Ḥārim

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī marched to the castle of Ḥārim which was held by the Franks, more precisely by Bohemond, the ruler of Antioch, for it is nearby, to the east of Antioch. Nūr al-Dīn besieged it and pressed hard on those within. It was a strong castle, a blockage in the Muslims' throats. The Franks gathered, those both near and far, and marched towards it to force Nūr al-Dīn to raise the siege.

In the fortress was one of their devils whose intelligence they recognized and whose opinion they deferred to. He sent to them to say, ‘We can hold the castle. We are not powerless. But do not put yourselves at risk by an engagement. If he defeats you, he will take this and others. The right course is to play a waiting game.’ In the end they sent to Nūr al-Dīn and came to terms with him on condition that they would give him half the lands of Ḥārim. They made peace on that basis and Nūr al-Dīn withdrew. One of the poets⁵ said:

You have clothed Muḥammad's religion, you that are its light [*nūr*],
 With glory that has lions above a star in Ursa Major.
 You have continued to maintain it with your waving spears
 Until its wavering frame was disciplined.
 Since you sharpened your determination to reach it,
 There was left no number to be feared and no preparation.
 If the pulpits were capable of speech,
 Their timbers, in place of the preachers, would praise you.⁶
 The Prince [*al-birins*], having donned [*tabarnasa*] abasement, saw
 A sanctuary⁷ for Ḥārim but the refuge is a hunting field.
 [209] Who denies that the flood will scatter the hillocks,
 When its father is that far-reaching thunder cloud?
 Or that the brightness of the sun will again be eclipsed
 By a blaze for which that meteor is a flint-stone.

⁴ Correcting the text's ‘Maḥmūd’ and following the variant reading given.

⁵ See Ibn Munīr, *Dīwān*, 262–4. Abū Shāma points out that, as Ibn Munīr died in 548/1153, either he wrote these verses in connection with a different occasion or this occasion fell in an earlier year (*Rawdatayn*, i, 323).

⁶ Two obscure and probably corrupt lines that follow have been omitted.

⁷ Reading *haram*, as in the *Dīwān*, instead of *hazm*.

There is no benefit for ancestors, however high they reach,
Until their offspring are raised up.

It is a long ode.

Account of the death of Khwārazm Shāh Atsiz and other rulers

This year on 9 Jumādā II [30 July 1156] Khwārazm Shāh Atsiz ibn Muḥammad ibn Anūshtakīn died. He had been afflicted by hemiplegia, received treatment but did not recover. He took some exceedingly ‘hot’ medicines without doctors’ orders. His illness intensified, his strength weakened and then he died. As death approached he was repeating, ‘My wealth has not availed me; my royal power has deserted me’. He was born in Rajab 490 [14 June–13 July 1097].

After his death his son Arslān succeeded. He slew a number of his uncles and blinded a brother of his, who died three days later, although it is reported that he committed suicide. Arslān sent to Sultan Sanjar, who had fled from imprisonment by the Oghuz, as we shall relate, offering allegiance and obedience. The sultan drew up a diploma for him for the governorship of Khwārazm and sent him robes of honour in Ramadān [18 October–16 November 1156]. He was left peaceful and secure in his rule.

Atsiz was a good ruler, not covetous of his subjects’ wealth, just and cherished by them, devoted to kindness and doing good. With him his people lived amongst abundant security and enveloping justice.

On 17th of the same month [3 November 1156] Abū'l-Fawāris Muḥammad ibn Arslān [210] Shāh, ruler of Kerman, died and was succeeded by his son Saljūqshāh.⁸

Also this year there died Prince Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān ibn Sulaymān ibn Qutlumush, the lord of Konya and neighbouring lands in Anatolia. His son Qilij Arslān came to power after him.⁹

Sultan Sanjar’s escape from the Oghuz

In Ramadān of this year [18 October–16 November 1156] Sultan Sanjar ibn

⁸ Ibn al-Athīr is confused over this Kerman branch of the Saljuqs. The text reads ‘Abū'l-Fawāris ibn Muḥammad’ but it was Muḥammad himself who died in 551/1156, not any son of his. According to *Tārīkh-e Kirmān*, 45, Muḥammad died 6 Jumādā I 551/27 June 1156, having ruled since 537/1142, and was succeeded by a son, Ṭughril Shāh, who died 29 March [558] 1163. Saljūqshāh was a brother of Muḥammad’s who sought to remove him and was killed in the reign of Ṭughril Shāh (Bosworth, ‘The Iranian World’, 134, and *Tārīkh-e Kirmān*, 47).

⁹ Rukn al-Dīn Mas'ūd, Saljuq sultan of Rūm (510–51/1117–56), was succeeded by 'Izz al-Dīn Qilij Arslān II who ruled until c.581/1185; see *EI(2)*, viii, 948.

Malikshāh escaped from the captivity of the Oghuz, he and several of the emirs who were with him. He went to the castle of Tirmidh and took steps to defend himself there against the Oghuz. Khwārazm Shāh Atsiz ibn Muḥammad ibn Anūshṭakīn and the Great Khān Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad¹⁰ were attacking the Oghuz and fighting them with their troops. The warfare between them was evenly balanced. Each [leader] of the Oghuz and the Khurasanians seized control of a part of Khurasan and consumed its revenues, lacking any head to unite them.

From Tirmidh Sultan Sanjar proceeded to the Oxus, intending to cross into Khurasan. It chanced that the chief of the Qarluq Turks, whose name was ‘Alī Beg, died. He was fiercely hostile to Sultan Sanjar and others and created much evil and trouble, fomenting dissensions. After his death the Qarluqs turned to Sultan Sanjar, as did other tribal groups both near and far. He returned to his capital at Marv in Ramadān. His captivity had lasted from 6 Jumādā I 548 [30 July 1153] until Ramadān of this year, 551 [18 October–16 November 1156].

[211] Account of the recognition of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’min as heir apparent of his father

During this year ‘Abd al-Mu’min ordered his son Muḥammad to be proclaimed as his heir apparent. There had been a stipulation and an understanding between ‘Abd al-Mu’min and ‘Umar al-Hintātī that the latter would take power after ‘Abd al-Mu’min. However, when ‘Abd al-Mu’min was firmly in power and his sons became many, he wished to hand on power to them. He summoned the emirs of the Arabs, from Hiāl, Ra’ba, ‘Abdī and others, rewarded them and showed them favour. He instigated someone to say to them that they should seek out ‘Abd al-Mu’min and say, ‘We want you to appoint us a successor from amongst your children, one whom the people will look to after you.’ They did this but he did not respond out of respect for ‘Umar al-Hintātī because of his high standing among the Almohads. He said to them, ‘Authority belongs to ‘Umar al-Hintātī.’ When ‘Umar learnt of this, he feared for himself, came before ‘Abd al-Mu’min and agreed to be demoted. Thereupon Muḥammad was proclaimed heir and letters to this effect were sent throughout all the lands. The khutbah was made in his name in all of them. That day ‘Abd al-Mu’min dispensed a vast amount of money.

How ‘Abd al-Mu’min gave governorships to his sons

This year ‘Abd al-Mu’min made his sons governors throughout his lands. He appointed his son Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh to Bougie and its districts, his son Abū'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī to Fez and its districts, his son Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar to the city of

¹⁰ The Qarakhanid sultan, son of Sanjar’s sister, died 557/1162.

Tlemcen and its districts and he put his son Abū Sa‘īd in charge of Ceuta, Algeciras¹¹ and Malaga. He made similar arrangements for the others.

He followed a remarkable course in appointing them. It was like this. He had appointed the renowned shaykhs of the Almohads, the companions of the Mahdi Muḥammad ibn Tūmart, [212] and was unable to dismiss them. He therefore took their sons and kept them with him, busy with their studies. When they were proficient in them and became models of learning, he said to their fathers, ‘I want you to be with me, so that I may rely on you in my various endeavours. Your sons can be in the provinces because they are learned scholars.’ They agreed to this, pleased and delighted. Their sons were given authority and then he arranged for some man whom he trusted to approach them, who said, ‘I see something terrible that you have done, in which you have abandoned prudence and good sense.’ They said, ‘What is that?’ He replied, ‘Your sons are in positions of power, while the sons of the Commander of the Faithful have none despite the learning and good political sense that they have. I fear that he may look at this and that your standing in his eyes may fall.’ They realized the truth of these words, presented themselves before ‘Abd al-Mu’min and said, ‘We wish you to appoint our lords, your sons, over the provinces.’ He replied, ‘No, I will not,’ but they persevered until he did so at their request.

Account of Sultan Muḥammad’s siege of Baghdad

During Dhū'l-Hijja this year¹² [15 January–12 February 1157] Sultan Muḥammad besieged Baghdad. The reason for this was that Sultan Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd sent to the caliph, requesting that the khutbah should be made in his name in Baghdad and Iraq. The caliph refused to agree to this, so the sultan set out for Iraq from Hamadhan with large forces. Atabeg Quṭb al-Dīn, ruler of Mosul, and his deputy Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī promised to send troops to reinforce him for his siege of Baghdad. He came to Iraq in Dhū'l-Hijja of the year 551 and the population at Baghdad fell into turmoil. The caliph sent to gather troops. Khutlubars came from Wāsiṭ but there was no compliance from [213] Arghush, lord of Basra, who indeed seized Wāsiṭ. Muhalhil also marched to Ḥilla and took it. The caliph and ‘Awn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra were busy with the siege. All the river boats were gathered together, the bridge cut and all assembled beneath the Tāj Palace. In the middle of Muḥarram 552 [27 February 1157] a proclamation was made that no-one should stay on the West Bank. The citizens and the country folk left in panic and goods were transferred to the Harem of the Caliphal Palace. The caliph demolished Qaṣr ‘Isā,¹³ al-Murabba'a, al-Qurayya, al-Mustajidda and al-Najmā. His men plundered

¹¹ Arabic al-Jazīra al-Khaḍrā'; see *EI*(2), ii, 524–5.

¹² *Muntazam*, x, 168ff, puts this account under the year 552.

¹³ i.e. Palace of ‘Isā, also the name of a quarter on east side below the mouth of ‘Isā Canal.

whatever they found. The followers of Muḥammad Shāh demolished Nahr al-Qallā'īn,¹⁴ al-Tūtha,¹⁵ Ibn Rizq Allāh Street, the Maydān Gate and Qaṭuftā.¹⁶ As for the inhabitants of Karkh and Basra Gate, they went out to Muḥammad's army and earned large amounts of money from them.

Sultan Muḥammad crossed to the West Bank above Ḥarbā and they sacked Uwāna. Zayn al-Dīn joined him there and they moved on together, until Muḥammad Shāh camped at al-Ramla. Meanwhile the caliph distributed weapons to the troops and the common people and erected trebuchets and ballistas.

On the 20 Muḥarram [4 March 1157] the troops of Muḥammad Shāh and Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī mounted up, took position at al-Raqqa and shot arrows towards the Tāj. The Baghdad mob crossed over and engaged them, shooting Greek fire and other things at them. A number of skirmishes ensued between them.

On the 3 Ṣafar [17 March 1157] they renewed the fighting and the action became fierce. Many of the Baghdad population crossed the river, either by swimming or in boats, and were killed.¹⁷ It was a dreadful day. The fighting between them continued all the time. The bridge over the Tigris was repaired and most of the [sultan's] army crossed over it to the East Bank, so that fighting took place on both sides. Zayn al-Dīn remained [214] on the West Bank. By order of the caliph the following announcement was made: 'Every person wounded shall have five dinars.' Every man that was wounded came before the vizier and was given five dinars. It happened that one of the common people received a wound that was not serious. He came to ask for the dinars. The vizier said to him, 'This wound is nothing', so he resumed the fight and was hit. His belly was torn open and some of his entrails came out. When carried to the vizier, he said, 'My lord vizier, does this satisfy you?' The vizier laughed and gave him double. He also arranged for someone to tend his wound until he was healed.

Supplies were hard to find among the [besieging] army, although meat, fruit and vegetables were plentiful. In Baghdad cereals were abundant because the vizier was distributing them to the army in place of cash and the troops were selling them. Prices there continued to be low, although for them meat, fruit and vegetables were scarce. The siege became hard for the inhabitants of Baghdad because of the interruption of supplies and the loss of their means of livelihood. Zayn al-Dīn and the Mosul contingent were not energetic in their fighting out of sympathy for the caliph and the Muslims. It is said that it was because Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, the older brother of Quṭb al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, sent

See Makdisi, 'Topography', 17, note 6, where also the location of al-Qurayya is discussed (cf. Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 333).

¹⁴ On the west bank, 'Canal of Friedmeat Sellers', see Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 81–4; a loop canal joining Tābiq Canal to Dujāj Canal and also a quarter of the same name.

¹⁵ A suburb on the west bank, see Makdisi, 'Topography', 17, note 8.

¹⁶ A district south-east of the Round city site, between the Dujāj and 'Īsā Canals (Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 97 and map IV).

¹⁷ Cf. *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 250, where a fierce battle on boats on the Tigris is described.

remonstrating with Zayn al-Dīn for fighting against the caliph, so he acted half-heartedly and without enthusiasm.

The battle continued most days. Sultan Muḥammad made four hundred ladders for his men to scale the wall. They attempted a violent assault, but the Baghdad citizens opened the city gates and called, ‘Why do you need ladders? These gates are open. Enter!’ but they were unable to approach them. While this was the situation, news came to Sultan Muḥammad that his brother Malikshāh and Īldikiz, lord of Arran, along with Prince Arslān, the son of Prince Ṭughril ibn Muḥammad and of Īldikiz’s [present] wife, had entered Hamadhan and taken control there, having seized the families of the emirs who were with Muḥammad Shāh and their property. [215] After he had heard this, Muḥammad Shāh intensified his attacks in the hope of achieving something but could do nothing. He therefore withdrew towards Hamadhan on 24 Rabī’ I 552 [6 May 1157].

Zayn al-Dīn returned to Mosul and that whole gathering disbanded with the intention of returning when Muḥammad Shāh had brought order to his lands. However, they never did gather again. In all their many engagements only a small number were killed on either side, but there were many wounded. When they retired they sacked Ba’qūbā and elsewhere on the Khurasan Road. When the army withdrew from Baghdad, serious feverish illnesses and heavy mortality afflicted the citizens because of the hardship they had undergone.

Malikshāh and Īldikiz and those with them left Hamadhan for Rayy. The prefect there, Īnānj, came out against them, fought and was defeated. Sultan Muḥammad sent the Emir Saqmas ibn Qaymāz al-Ḥarāmī¹⁸ with a troop to reinforce Īnānj. Saqmas set out when Īldikiz and Malikshāh with their followers had withdrawn from Rayy, intending to besiege the caliph. Saqmas met and fought them but they defeated him and plundered his troops and his baggage-train. Sultan Muḥammad needed to make haste, so he set out and, having reached Hulwān, heard that Īldikiz was at Dīnawar. A messenger from his lieutenant Īnānj came to him with news that he had entered Hamadhan and restored the khutbah for him there. Muḥammad’s morale was strengthened. Shumla, lord of Khuzistan, fled to his lands and most of Īldikiz’s and Malikshāh’s host scattered. They were left with 5,000 horsemen and returned to their lands like fugitives. When Muḥammad Shāh set out for Hamadhan, he planned to attack the lands of Īldikiz but he began a consumptive illness, which stayed with him until his death.

[216] Miscellaneous events

In Rabī’ I this year [24 April–23 May 1156] Abū'l-Badr, son of the Vizier Ibn Hubayra, was released from Takrit prison. When he came to Baghdad, his brother

¹⁸ This is an unlikely *nisba* for a Turkish emir, as it applies to persons who have as their ancestor Ḥarām al-Anṣārī (see *Ansāb*, iv, 102). Perhaps one should read al-Ḥarrānī.

and a ceremonial escort went out to meet him. It was a memorable day. He had stayed in prison more than three years.

In Rabī' II [June 1156]¹⁹ there was a fire at Baghdad and much was destroyed. Fire broke out in the streets of Firāshā,²⁰ the Horses (*al-Dawābb*) and the Brickmaker (*al-Labbān*), the Waste of Ibn Jarada,²¹ [the districts of] al-Zafariyya, al-Khātūniyya,²² the Caliphal Palace, the Azaj Gate and the Sultan's Market.

In Shawwāl [17 November-15 December 1156] the Ismā'īlīs attacked Tabas in Khurasan. They did great damage there and took prisoner several of the sultan's leading statesmen. They plundered their property and their stables and killed some of them.

The following died this year:

The Shaykh of Islam Abū'l-Ma'ālī al-Hasan ibn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-Razzāz, at Nishapur in Dhū'l-Qa'da [16 December 1156-14 January 1157]. He was one of the leading scholars.

Murīd al-Dīn ibn Nīsān, the headman of Āmid and the man who dominated its ruler. His son, Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim, succeeded to what he had held.

Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghaznawī, the celebrated preacher, at Baghdad. He had come there in the year 516 [1122-23] and was very well received by sultans, common people and caliphs, except that al-Muqtafī turned away from him after the death of Sultan Mas'ūd because of the favour [217] shown him by the sultan. His death occurred in Muḥarram [March 1156].²³

Abū'l-Ḥasan ibn al-Khul, the Shāfi'i lawyer, shaykh of the Shāfi'īs in Baghdad, who was one of the pupils of Abū Bakr al-Shāshī. He united both learning and practical piety. He served the caliph as imam when he prayed.

Ibn al-Āmidī, the poet, who came from al-Nīl and was one of the leading poets in the generation of al-Ghazzī and al-Arajānī. He lived for more than ninety years.

Muẓaffar ibn Ḥammād ibn Abī'l-Khayr, the lord of the Marsh, who was killed this year. He was killed while in the bath by Nafīs ibn Faḍl ibn Abī'l-Khayr and was succeeded by his son.

al-Wa'wā' al-Ḥalabī, the celebrated poet.²⁴

¹⁹ See *Muntazam*, x, 165, where the date is 29 Rabī' II/21 June.

²⁰ Identical perhaps with 'Chambermaid Road' (*darb al-farrāsha*), see Makdisi, 'Topography', 30, note 8.

²¹ Following the variant reading. See Makdisi, 'Topography', 33, note 11: in fact it was an east-side inhabited quarter, re-developed amid remains of former glories.

²² Perhaps the area around the Khātūniyya Madrasah, founded by Turkhān Khātūn, the wife of Malikshāh.

²³ Died the eve of Thursday 27 Muḥarram/22 March 1156 (*Muntazam*, x, 166-8). Ibn al-Jawzī thought him unlearned and disapproved of his attacks on the caliph, his ambition and his seeking favour with the Saljuq regime.

²⁴ This 'grammarian, poet and scholar' is named as Abū'l-Faraj 'Abd al-Qāhir ibn 'Ubayd Allāh al-Farrāsh in Ibn al-'Adīm, *Bughya*, x, 4746.

The doctor Abū Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī at Isfara‘īn during Ramaḍān [18 October–16 November 1156]. He was greatly learned in the sciences of the ancient doctors.

Account of earthquakes in Syria

In Rajab of this year [9 August-7 September 1157] there were many strong earthquakes in Syria, which destroyed much of the country and which caused the death of more people than could be counted. In one moment Hama, Shayzar, Kafarṭāb, al-Ma'arra, Homs, Ḥiṣn al-Akrād,¹ 'Arqa, Lattakia, Tripoli and Antioch were ruined. All Syria suffered damage in most of its parts, even if the damage was not total. City walls and citadels were demolished. Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd dealt with this in an exemplary manner. He feared for the land since the city walls had been destroyed. He assembled the troops and camped on the frontiers of his land, carrying out raids on Frankish territory, while working on the walls in the rest of his lands. He kept this up until he had completed all the city walls.

The great number of people who were killed is sufficiently indicated by the fact that a teacher who was in his town, namely Hama, left the Koran school for some matter of business that occurred, when the earthquake came and destroyed the town. The school collapsed on all the children. The teacher said, 'Not a single person came to enquire after any child of his.'

[219] How Nūr al-Dīn took the castle of Shayzar

We shall begin by telling of this castle and who held it before it was taken by Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī. This castle is near Hama, half a day's journey away, situated on a high hill which is very defensible, as it can be approached by a single path. It belonged to the Munqidh family, Kinānīs among whom it passed by inheritance from the days of Ṣāliḥ ibn Mirdās,² until it came to Abū'l-Murhaf Naṣr ibn 'Alī ibn al-Muqallad after his father Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī. He held it until he died in the year 491 [1097-98]. He was a brave and noble man. When his death was near, he appointed as his deputy his brother Abū Salāma Murshid ibn 'Alī who said, 'By God, I shall not be ruler. I shall leave this world as I entered it.' [Murshid] was learned in the Koran and belles-lettres and was the father of Mu'ayyad al-Dawla Usāma ibn Munqidh. He made his younger brother Sultān ibn 'Alī the ruler and the two brothers cooperated extremely well for a period of time.

Murshid fathered several male children who grew up as noble lords, for

¹ i.e. Crac des Chevaliers, see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 146-63.

² Asad al-Dawla Ṣāliḥ, an Arab of Kilāb (died Rabī' II 420/May 1029) was the founder of the Mirdāsid dynasty of N.Syria and the Jazīra (early 11th century AD to 472/1080); see *EI*(2), vii, 115-23.

example ‘Izz al-Dawla Abū'l-Hasan ‘Alī, Mu’ayyad al-Dawla Usāma and others. His brother Sultān produced no male child until he was old, when some male children did come. This made Sultān envious of his brother and he feared for his sons from those of his brother. Evil men caused trouble between them and set each brother against the other. Sultān wrote some verses to his brother Murshid to censure him for things that he had heard about him. Murshid answered him with verses in the same vein, the relevant parts of which I have decided to record. These are the verses:

Zalūm insisted on persevering with injustice and on going to extremes in her aloofness and rejection.

She complained that we rejected her but the fault in this was hers. How strange, a wrong-doer (*zālim*) who comes complaining!

She listened to those who slandered me. Often have I flouted one who blamed my love for her or a slanderer.

[220] Pride of beauty inclined her to hate me, but far be it that I should ever hate her,

Or forget the promises she laid up, although she has shown harshness and a pretence of forgetfulness.

When a gem of your verses came to me, you gathered in it for me high thoughts and ideas.

I had shunned poetry for a while, because it turned its back on me to my dismay, when my youth deserted me.

What has excellent diction to do with the sixty-year-old? When I aim at the lowest language, it rebels against me.

I said, ‘My brother will care for my sons and my family and uphold my undertaking towards them and my responsibility.

He will requite them with what I have not enjoined him to do, for my own sake, for I have prepared it from my inheritance.’

Why now, when time has bent my straight back and blunted in me a sword that was keen,

Have you changed so that your kindness has turned to harshness and your closeness to them become roughness and distance?

I have become empty-handed of what I hoped for. I see that despair has effaced the track of my hopes.

However, I have not wavered from what I promised and these years have not changed my love.

There is no wonder in times of trouble that I see you as my right hand and other folk as my left.

Deck yourself with this [poem], a virgin, if the stars of the heavens were compared with her, they would no longer be counted shining stars.

It decks itself with pearls of your qualities which adorn it as threaded pearls adorn beautiful girls.

Live long to build up glory that was weak and to erect an edifice of liberality that was crumbling.

There was still some restraint in their relations³ but, when Murshid died in the year 531 [1136-37], his brother became shamelessly hostile towards [Murshid's] sons⁴ and began to treat them badly. He expelled them from Shayzar and they went their various ways. Most of them sought out Nūr al-Dīn and complained of what they had suffered from their uncle. He was angered by this but was unable to attack him, to revenge them and restore them to their native place because he was fully occupied with the Jihad against the Franks and because he feared that Shayzar might be surrendered to the Franks.

[221] Later Sultān died and his sons continued after him. Nūr al-Dīn heard that they were in contact with the Franks and his rage against them was great but he waited for an opportunity to act. When during this year the citadel was ruined because of the earthquake we have mentioned, not one of the Banū Munqidh who were there survived.

The reason why they all perished was that the ruler there had circumcised a son of his and gave a feast for the elite. He summoned all the Banū Munqidh to him in his residence. He had a horse of which he was very fond and from which he could hardly be separated. Whenever he was in his council chamber the horse would be placed at the door. That day the horse was at the door of the residence, when the earthquake came. All rose to get out. When they arrived at the door in panic to escape the building, the horse kicked the first man and killed him. The people were prevented from leaving and the building collapsed on all of them. The citadel was demolished and the curtain wall fell down, as did every structure within. Only a few fled and survived. One of [Nūr al-Dīn's] emirs hastened there, as he was in the neighbourhood, and seized it. Nūr al-Dīn took it over, established control and repaired the walls and the buildings, restoring them as new.

Account of the death of al-Dubaysī, lord of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar, and Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd's seizure of power there

Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar belonged to Atabek Zankī. When he was killed in the year 541 [1146-47], his son Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī assigned it as a fief to Emir Abū Bakr al-Dubaysī, who was one of his father's greatest emirs. It remained in his hands until this time and his hold on it was so strong that it was impossible for Quṭb al-Dīn to

³ This interpretation (particularly of *tamāsuk*) is supported by the parallel wording in *Bāhir*, 112: *kān al-amr fī-hi ba'd al-sitr* ('there was a certain concealing of the situation ...').

⁴ For the Arabic expression, literally 'he turned towards his [brother's] children the back of the shield', see Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v. *j.n.n.*

take it from him. He died during Dhū'l-Hijja 551 [15 January–12 February 1157], without leaving any son. A mamluke of his, called Ghulbeg, took control there and was obeyed by its troops. Mawdūd besieged them for three months and then in Ṣafar 553 [March 1158] took it over from Ghulbeg to whom he gave a large fief in exchange.

[222] Account of the death of Sultan Sanjar

In Rabī‘ I of this year⁵ [April 1157] Sultan Abū'l-Ḥārith Sanjar ibn Malikshāh ibn Alp Arslān died, afflicted with colic, followed by diarrhoea, from which he died.⁶ He was born at Sinjār in Mesopotamia in Rajab 479⁷ [12 October–19 November 1086]. He made Khurasan his residence and settled in the city of Marv. He entered Baghdad with his brother, Sultan Muḥammad, and along with him met with the caliph. Muḥammad was recognized as sultan and Sanjar was appointed heir.

After the death of Muḥammad, Sanjar was proclaimed sultan and became well established. Other sultans gave him allegiance and he was proclaimed as paramount sultan on most of the pulpits of Islam for about forty years. Before that for twenty years he had been named in the khutbah as prince. His status remained high and his success ever growing until he was taken prisoner by the Oghuz, as we have related. After a while he escaped and gathered his supporters⁸ to himself at Marv. His kingdom was almost restored to him but his end forestalled him. He was respected, generous and gentle towards his subjects. During his reign his lands were safe and secure.

When he died, he was buried in a domed mausoleum which he had built for himself and called the House of the After-life. When the news of his demise reached Baghdad, the khutbah in his name was stopped and there was no session of condolence for him in the Diwan.

When Sultan Sanjar was close to death, he appointed as his deputy in Khurasan Prince Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Bughrā Khān, Sultan Sanjar's nephew, who remained there in fear of the Oghuz. He then went to Jurjān to make it his strong base. The Oghuz returned to Marv and Khurasan. A group [223] of the troops of Khurasan gathered around al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba, who seized control of a part of Khurasan. Khurasan remained in this disturbed state until the year 554 [1159–60].

The Oghuz sent to Prince Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad and asked him to come to them so that they might make him their ruler but he did not trust them and feared

⁵ *Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 233, specifies Monday 14 Rabī‘ I/26 April (= Friday!) 1157.

⁶ For an account of Sanjar's long life, see *EI*(2), ix, 15–17.

⁷ Ibn al-Athīr repeats here the date found in his source, *Muntazam*, x, 178. Elsewhere he gave the date Rajab 477/November 1084 (see Richards, *Annals*, 220).

⁸ In the Arabic *aṭrāf* which confusingly can mean men of high or low degree. *Muntazam*, x, 178, has *aṣḥāb* (followers), but in Ibn Qal., 338, there is the fuller 'gathering to himself the troops who had been dispersed'.

for his life. He sent his son to them, whom they obeyed for a little while. Subsequently Prince Maḥmūd joined with them, as we shall relate under the year 553 [1158-59].

Account of the Muslims' capture of Almeria and the end of the dynasty of the Veiled Ones in Andalusia

This year the dynasty of the Veiled Ones in Andalusia ended and the followers of ‘Abd al-Mu’min took the city of Almeria from the Franks. This came about in the following manner. After ‘Abd al-Mu’min had given his son Abū Sa‘īd control of Algeciras and Málaga, Abū Sa‘īd crossed the sea to Málaga and adopted it as his capital. Maymūn ibn Badr al-Lamtūnī, lord of Granada, wrote to him that he would join the Almohad cause and surrender Granada to him. Abū Sa‘īd accepted this and took over Granada. Maymūn went to Málaga with his household and children and was welcomed with honour by Abū Sa‘īd who sent him to Marrakech, where ‘Abd al-Mu’min received him kindly. The dynasty of the Veiled Ones came to an end. All that remained to them was the island of Majorca under Ḥammū ibn Ghāniya.

After Abū Sa‘īd gained Granada, he assembled his troops and marched to Almeria, which was in Frankish hands. They had taken it from the Muslims in the year 542 [1147-48]. When he descended upon it, the fleet came to him from Ceuta with a great host of Muslims. They besieged [224] Almeria by land and by sea. The Franks retired to its fortress, where they were blockaded. Abū Sa‘īd’s army camped on the hill overlooking the city and he built a wall on this hill down to the sea and dug a ditch before it. The city and the fortress where the Franks were became encompassed by the wall and ditch. Anyone who tried to relieve them was unable to reach them. Alfonso, king of the Franks in Andalusia, known as ‘Little Sultan’, gathered 12,000 Frankish horse, along with Muḥammad ibn Sa‘d ibn Mardanīsh at the head of 6,000 Muslim horse. They tried to get through to Almeria but the Muslims repulsed them, so ‘Little Sultan’ and Ibn Mardanīsh withdrew frustrated. On the way back ‘Little Sultan’ died before he reached Toledo.

The siege of Almeria lasted for three months. Supplies were restricted and food became scarce for the Franks, so they sought terms to surrender the fortress. Abū Sa‘īd agreed to this, gave them terms and received the surrender of the fortress. The Franks left by sea back to their lands, their rule over Almeria having lasted for ten years.

How the ruler of Ṭabaristān raided the Ismā‘īlīs

This year the Shāh of Māzandarān, Rustum ibn ‘Alī ibn Shahriyār, gathered his troops and marched away, although he told no-one his destination. He followed narrow passes and made haste towards Alamūt, which belonged to the Ismā‘īlīs.

He carried out a raid and burnt villages and the countryside. He killed many, plundered property, seized their womenfolk and enslaved their children whom he sold in the marketplace, before returning safely and rich in booty. The Ismā‘ilīs were sorely stricken and overwhelmed by a powerlessness the like of which they had not experienced. He so ruined their lands that they were not made productive for many years.

[225] How the pilgrims of Khurasan were seized

This year in Rabi‘ I [13 April–12 May 1157] the pilgrims from Khurasan set out and after they had departed from Bisṭām a party of the Khurasanian troops, who had attacked Ṭabaristān, raided them, took some of their goods and killed a small number of them. The rest who survived moved on from that place. However, while they were travelling, the Ismā‘ilīs intercepted them. The pilgrims fought them hard and held firm valiantly, but their leader was killed and they lost heart, gave in and surrendered, asking for terms. They threw down their weapons when they asked for quarter. The Ismā‘ilīs seized and slew them. They spared only a small band. Amongst those killed were a large number of ulema, ascetics and pious men. This was a great disaster that touched all the lands of Islam and particularly Khurasan. There was not a single town that did not grieve for a loss.

On the following day an old man wandered amid the dead and wounded, crying, ‘Muslims, pilgrims! The heretics have gone. I am a Muslim. Anyone who wants water, I can give him a drink.’ If anyone replied, he killed him, putting an end to him. All perished, except for some who had escaped by running away – and very few they were.

Account of the conflict between al-Mu’ayyad [Ay-Aba] and Emir Ay-Tāq

We have mentioned the advancement of Emir Ay-Aba, Sultan Sanjar’s mamluke, and his taking command of the Khurasanian troops. He was envied by several emirs, including Emir Ay-Tāq,⁹ [226] one of Sanjar’s emirs, who turned against him. At one time he sought Khwārazm Shāh, at another the Shāh of Mazandaran, and at yet another he made a show of agreement with al-Mu’ayyad, while harbouring dissent.

At this present moment he left Mazandaran with 10,000 horsemen, for everyone who wanted to raid the land and everyone at odds with al-Mu’ayyad had rallied to him. He made for Khurasan and dwelt in the districts of Nasā and Abīward, not openly showing dissent towards al-Mu’ayyad but corresponding with him in cooperative and supportive terms, while harbouring the opposite.

⁹ From a variety of readings the edition adopts Īthāq. Ai-Taq is the spelling given by Bosworth, ‘The Iranian world’, 156 and 185.

Al-Mu'ayyad switched from an exchange of letters to open opposition. He marched against him, lightly equipped, and fell upon him and dealt him a serious defeat. His followers abandoned him and he himself escaped by the skin of his teeth. Al-Mu'ayyad and his army gained as booty all that Ay-Tāq possessed. The latter fled in rout to Mazandaran.

The ruler there was Rustum, between whom and his brother, called 'Alī, there was a rivalry for power. Rustum had been the stronger. When Ay-Tāq arrived at Mazandaran, he killed 'Alī and took his head to his brother Rustum. This outraged Rustum, who was intensely and fiercely angry. He said, 'I may consume my own flesh [and blood] but I do not feed it to others.'

Ay-Tāq continued to criss-cross Khurasan, plundering and raiding, especially at the city of Isfarā'in, for he attacked it many times until it was a ruin. Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad and al-Mu'ayyad wrote to him, inviting him to come to some agreement but he refused. They marched against him with their troops. When they drew near, many of his army came to them but he slipped away before them to Ṭabaristān in Ṣafar 553 [March 1158]. They pursued him with their troops. The Shāh of Mazandaran sent asking for peace, to which they agreed and came to terms. Shāh of Mazandaran sent great sums of money and precious gifts, while Ay-Tāq sent his son as a hostage, so the two others withdrew.

[227] Account of the conflict between al-Mu'ayyad and Sunqur al-'Azīzī

Sunqur al-'Azīzī was one of Sultan Sanjar's emirs and another of the rivals of al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba. When the latter was preoccupied with his war with Ay-Tāq, Sunqur left Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad's army and went to Herat. He entered the city, where there was a body of Turks, and entrenched himself securely. He was advised to gain the support of Prince al-Ḥusayn, the ruler of the Ghūrids, but he did not. He relied on himself alone, because he saw that the emirs were at odds with Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad and he was ambitious and convinced himself that he was strong enough. Al-Mu'ayyad marched against him in Herat. When he arrived, he fought some actions against the defenders but then the Turks inclined to him and gave him their allegiance. From that moment information about Sunqur al-'Azīzī ceased and it was not known what happened to him. It was said that he fell from his horse and died. It was otherwise asserted that the Turks murdered him.

Sultan Maḥmūd proceeded to the province of Herat with his troops and levies. A group of Sunqur's troops joined forces with Emir Ay-Tāq and raided Ṭūs and its villages. The crop planting and ploughing were spoilt and devastation overwhelmed the region. Disturbances were widespread throughout the various parts of Khurasan. The people were the victims of the Evil Eye, for in the days of Sultan Sanjar they had had a very soft and secure life. This is the way of the world. Its well-being and its blessings are not free from corruption, contaminations and

disasters. Seldom is its evil kept clear of its good. We pray God to make our remaining days happy ones through Muḥammad and his family.

Account of Nūr al-Dīn's taking of Baalbek

This year Nūr al-Dīn took possession of Baalbek and its citadel. It had been in the hands of a man called Ɗahhāk al-Biqā'ī (named with reference to the Biqā' of Baalbek), who had been put in charge of it by [228] the lord of Damascus. After Nūr al-Dīn had taken Damascus, Ɗahhāk continued to hold out there. Nūr al-Dīn had been unable to besiege him because of his proximity to the Franks. He made the best of this situation until this present time, when he seized and established control over it.¹⁰

Miscellaneous events

During this year the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh removed the door of the Kaaba and replaced it with a door plated with gilded silver. From the original door he made for himself a coffin in which he would be buried when he died.

This year there died Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ibn Muḥammad ibn Thābit, Abū Bakr al-Khujandī, the head of the Shāfi‘īs in Isfahan. He heard Ḥadīth there from Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥaddād. He was a leading religious authority in the eyes of the sultans and was a man of great modesty and wide influence. At the time of his death a major disturbance broke out in Isfahan in which a large number of people were killed.

In Khurasan this year there was a severe famine, in which all the beasts of burden were eaten, and even people. In Nishapur there was a cook, who cut the throat of an Alid, cooked him and sold him among his wares. It was discovered that he had done this, so he was executed. The famine came to an end and the condition of the people improved.

The following died this year:

Cadi Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn Bakhtiyār ibn 'Alī al-Mānidāī of Wāsiṭ, where he was cadi. He was a lawyer and a scholar of religion.¹¹

Cadi Burhān al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim Manṣūr ibn Abī Sa'īd Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr Aḥmad al-Ṣā'idi, the cadi of Nishapur. He was one of the leading Ḥanafī lawyers.¹²

¹⁰ Abū Shāma dates the taking of Baalbek to 550/1155–6, expressly contrary to Ibn al-Athīr (*Rawdatayn*, i, 318). In Rabī' I 552/ April 1157 Nūr al-Dīn inspected conditions and the garrison's state in 'Baalbek district', which suggests that it was already held (Ibn Qal., 338).

¹¹ He was the author of a book on the cadis and a history of the Iraq Marshes. He died in Jumādā II/11 July–8 August 1157 (*Munṭazam*, x, 177–8).

¹² Born 475/1082. He had a son 'Alī, who was also cadi of Nishapur and died in Rayy in 554/1159. See Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 215–16

Account of the conflict between Sunqur and Arghush

In this year there was a serious conflict between Sunqur al-Hamadhānī and Arghush al-Mustarshidī. The reason was that Sunqur al-Hamadhānī had plundered the agricultural hinterland of Baghdad on the Khurasan Road and his following had grown numerous. The Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh went out in person during Jumādā I [June 1158] to seek him. When he arrived at the town of al-Lihf, the Emir Khuṭlubars said to him, ‘I will deal with this business for you.’ There was a friendship between him and Sunqur. He rode to a meeting with him and delivered a lengthy reprimand for Sunqur’s abandonment of his allegiance to the caliph. Sunqur agreed to be loyal and Khuṭlubars on his return repaired Sunqur’s relations with the caliph, who granted him and Emir Arghush al-Mustarshidī the town of al-Lihf as a fief.

When the two of them went to al-Lihf, a dispute arose between them. Sunqur wished to arrest Arghush, but saw that he took precaution against that. Conflict followed and they fought a fierce battle. Arghush was betrayed by his men, so returned defeated to Baghdad. Sunqur took sole control of al-Lihf and made the khutbah for Prince Muḥammad. A force was dispatched from Baghdad to fight him, led by Khuṭlubars. There was a fierce battle between them, which resulted in the flight of Sunqur and the death of his men. His possessions were plundered and he himself went to the castle of Māhkī. He seized what it contained and left one of his mamlukes there as his deputy, before proceeding to Hamadhan. Prince Muḥammad Shāh would have nothing to do with him, so he returned to Māhkī, where he took up residence.

[230] Account of hostilities between Shumla and Qāymāz al-Sultānī

Also in this year there was a battle between Shumla, the lord of Khuzistan, with whom was Ibn Makaliya, and Qāymāz al-Sultānī in the region of Bādarāyā. The [first] two gathered their troops and marched against Qāymāz, who heard news of this when he was at a drinking session and did not pay much attention to it. He rode to meet them with 300 horsemen, for he had a high opinion of himself. He charged them and was surrounded in the mêlée that followed. He fought fiercely but his men fled and he himself was taken prisoner. A Turkoman who had a blood claim against him, because Qāymāz had killed a son of his, took charge of him, slew him in retaliation for his son and sent his head to Muḥammad Shāh.

The caliph then sent an army to fight Shumla and his allies. The latter withdrew

as the army advanced and joined Prince Malikshāh in Khuzistan, where many of them perished from the cold.

How the Oghuz renewed their disturbances in Khurasan

The Oghuz Turks had remained at Balkh, where they settled and gave up their plundering and killing in the territory of Khurasan. They all agreed to obey Sultan Khāqān Maḥmūd ibn Arslān [Khān Muḥammad]. The man in control of the affairs of state was al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba and Maḥmūd acted on his advice.

When this year came, the Oghuz set out from Balkh towards Marv in Sha'bān [28 August–25 September 1158]. Sultan Maḥmūd was at Sarakhs with his troops. With a body of these troops al-Mu'ayyad marched [231] against the Oghuz and fell upon a group of them whom he overwhelmed. He kept up the pursuit until they entered Marv in the early part of Ramaḍān [began 26 September]. He plundered their flocks and returned to Sarakhs.

He and Sultan Maḥmūd agreed to attack and fight the Oghuz, so gathered their forces and marched against them. They made contact on 6 Shawwāl of this year [31 October 1158]. The battle that followed between them lasted a long time. They continued to fight from Monday 9 Shawwāl [3 November] until halfway through the eve of Wednesday 11 Shawwāl [5 November]. They fought a number of successive engagements, taking no rest or respite except for what was necessary. The Oghuz were broken three times but returned to the battle. When dawn came on the Wednesday, it became clear that the battle had ended in the defeat and disintegration of the Khurasanian army. The triumphant Oghuz slew many of them and the wounded and captured were even more numerous.

Al-Mu'ayyad and the survivors with him returned to Tūs, leaving the Oghuz to take control of Marv. They behaved well and respected the ulema and the imams, such as Tāj al-Dīn Abū Sa'īd al-Sam'ānī and the Shaykh of Islam 'Alī al-Balkhī and others. They raided Sarakhs, where the villages were ruined and the inhabitants fled. About 10,000 of the populace of Sarakhs were killed. They also plundered Tūs, where they killed all but a few of the people, and then went back to Marv.

Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad Khān and the troops with him were not able to remain in Khurasan because of the Oghuz and went to Jurjān, waiting for the next move of the Oghuz. When it was the year 554 [1159–60], the Oghuz sent to Sultan Maḥmūd asking him to come to them to be made ruler over them, but he did not trust them and feared what they might do to him. They sent [232] requesting him to send his son, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, to be made ruler over them and for them to act on his commands and prohibitions in matters great and small. Envoys went to and fro and Sultan Maḥmūd made cautious arrangements for his son through a treaty, undertakings and a settling of basic rules. He then dispatched his son from Jurjān to Khurasan. When the Oghuz emirs heard of his coming, they travelled from Marv to meet him on the way, which they did at Nishapur, and received him

with honour and respect. He entered Nishapur and the Oghuz forces joined him and assembled before him on 23 Rabī' II 554 [14 May 1159].

Subsequently Sultan Maḥmūd moved from Jurjān to Khurasan with the troops he had from the emirs of Sanjar. Al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba stayed behind. The sultan came to the boundaries of Nasā and Abīward. He assigned Nasā as a fief to an emir called 'Umar ibn Ḥamza al-Nasawī, who held it in an exemplary fashion and defended it from the hands of trouble-makers. Sultan Maḥmūd remained outside Nasā until the end of Jumādā II [18 July 1159].

When the Oghuz were in Nishapur this year, they sent to the inhabitants of Tūs, summoning them to obedience and cooperation. The men of Rāykān¹ refused to comply with this, misguidedly trusting in their town walls and their own courage, strength, abundant supplies and ample stores. A detachment of Oghuz attacked and besieged them. They seized the town, killed many and plundered much, before returning to Nishapur. Then they went to Bayhaq with Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd Khān, and besieged Sābzawār on 17 Jumādā II 554 [6 July 1159]. The inhabitants resisted, led by the Syndic 'Imād al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-'Alawī al-Ḥusaynī, the syndic of the Alids. They rallied around him, deferred to his orders and prohibitions and followed his counsel. They resisted the Oghuz, held [233] the town against them and fought resolutely.

Having seen their resistance and their strength, the Oghuz made peace overtures to them, which were agreed upon. During these hostilities only one man of the Sābzawār populace was killed. Prince Jalāl al-Dīn and the Oghuz departed from Sābzawār on 27 Jumādā II [16 July] and went to Nasā and Abīward.

How al-Mu'ayyad was captured and then escaped

We have already mentioned that al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba stayed behind in Jurjān and did not go with the Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad. At this present time he left Jurjān for Khurasan and stopped in one of the villages of Khabūshān,² which was called Zānak, where there was a castle. When the Oghuz heard of his coming to Zānak, they set out and surrounded him there. He left in flight but one of the Oghuz saw him and seized him. Ay-Aba promised a handsome sum of money, if he freed him. The Oghuz tribesman said, 'Where is the money?' He replied, 'It is hidden in one of these hills.'

Ay-Aba and the Turkoman set out together and came to the wall of a village where were orchards and springs. Ay-Aba said to the [Turkoman] horseman, 'The money is here,' and then climbed the wall, jumped down the other side and ran off. He saw that the Oghuz were everywhere,³ so entered a village, where a miller

¹ Rāykān is an older form of Rādkān, a small town and an area near Tūs, the birthplace of Niẓām al-Mulk (see Krawulsky, 108; Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 394).

² This is modern Qūchān, between Bujmird and Mashhad in N.E. Iran.

³ Literally 'had filled the earth'.

recognized him and told the village chieftain of his presence. He begged him for a mount, got what he asked for and so helped Ay-Aba to get to Nishapur. On his arrival the troops flocked around him, his power grew and his position was restored. He treated the miller very well and was extremely generous to him.

[234] Account of Sultan Maḥmūd's meeting with the Oghuz and their return to Nishapur

When the Oghuz, accompanied by Prince Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd Khān, came to Nasā and Abīward, as we have mentioned, his father Sultan Maḥmūd Khān, who was there with the Khurasanian troops he had, came forth and met with them. It was unanimously agreed to obey him. His plan was to revive and preserve the land but he was unable to do that. After their meeting, they went in Sha'bān [554] [August–September 1159] to Nishapur, where was al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba. When he heard of their approach he left for Khawāf on 16th of the month [2 September 1159]. They arrived on 21st of the month [7 September] and made camp. The inhabitants were greatly afraid of them but they did nothing to them and left on 26th [12 September] for Sarakhs and Marv.

The lawyer al-Mu'ayyad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Muwaffaqī, the head of the Shāfi'īs, the member of an ancient house and a grandchild of the Imam Abū Sahl al-Ṣa'lūkī, was in Nishapur. He was connected by marriage to the family of Abū'l-Ma'ālī al-Juwaynī and was the leading man of the city and much respected. He had more followers than could be numbered. It happened that one of his followers accidentally killed a Shāfi'ī, whose name was Abū'l-Futūḥ al-Fustaqqānī. This Abū'l-Futūḥ had a connection with the syndic of the Alids in Nishapur, who was Dhakhr al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasānī.⁴ This syndic was the authority in Nishapur at this period. Angry at this case, he sent for the lawyer al-Mu'ayyad and demanded the person of the killer to exact retribution, threatening him if he did not comply. However, al-Mu'ayyad refused to hand him over and said, 'You have no right to interfere with our followers. Your authority only covers the Alid community.' The syndic assembled his men and other attendants and attacked the Shāfi'īs who banded to meet and fight him. Several of them were killed and then the syndic burnt down the Perfumers' Market and also Mu'ādh's Street, Zāhir Garden's Street [235] and the house of the Imam of the Two Sanctuaries Abū'l-Ma'ālī al-Juwaynī. The lawyer al-Mu'ayyad al-Shāfi'ī lived there because they were related by marriage.⁵

⁴ Correct text's 'al-Ḥusaynī'. For the al-Ḥasanī family of Nishapur, see Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, chapter 15.

⁵ He was the great-grandson of al-Juwaynī through a daughter of the latter, see Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 127.

The crisis grew serious for the inhabitants at large. Later on al-Mu'ayyad, the lawyer, gathered his supporters from Tūs, Isfarā'in, Juwayn and elsewhere. They killed one of the followers of the Syndic Zayd, known as Ibn al-Hājjī al-Ashnānī. The Alids and those with them reacted strongly. They fought a battle on 18 Shawwāl of the year 554 [2 November 1159] and the conflict raged on. Madrasahs, markets and mosques were burnt down and many Shāfi'iis were slain. Al-Mu'ayyad took refuge in the castle of Farkhak. The ability of the Shāfi'iis to fight became limited. Subsequently al-Mu'ayyad moved to a village of Tūs. All Shāfi'i teaching in Nishapur was cancelled, the town fell into ruin and the death-toll was vast.⁶

Account of the lord of Khutlān's siege of Tirmidh, his withdrawal and his death

In Rajab of this year [29 July-27 August 1158] Prince Abū Shujā' Farrukhshāh, who claimed that he was descended from Bahrām Gūr whom we have already mentioned under the reign of Chosroes Parvīz, proceeded to Tirmidh and put it under siege.

This came about because he had been subject to Sultan Sanjar who, when the Oghuz rebelled against him, summoned Farrukhshāh to join him in making war on them. He gathered his troops and put it out that he was on the way at the head of the troops he had, but he stayed where he was to await the outcome. If⁷ Sanjar was victorious, he would present himself and say, [236] 'You fought before I could come'; but if victory went to the Oghuz, he would say [to them], 'I delayed because of my good will [towards you] and my wish that you should take power.' After Sanjar was defeated and there happened what we have narrated, Farrukhshāh continued until this present time, when he went to Tirmidh to besiege it. The ruler, Fīrūzshāh Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Qumāj,⁸ mobilized his army and confronted him to thwart his purpose. They fought a battle and Farrukhshāh⁹ fled in defeat, not stopping for anything. While on his way, he was struck down by a colic, from which he died.

How al-Mu'ayyad returned to Nishapur and ruined what survived of it

This year [554/1159] al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba returned to Nishapur with his troops,

⁶ See the account of these events and those in the further section just below in Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 78-81.

⁷ Following the variant *fa-in* rather than *fa-lammā*.

⁸ Imād al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alā' al-Dīn Abī Bakr ibn Qumāj, formerly one of Sanjar's generals (*Zubdat al-tawārikh*, 232-3).

⁹ The edition in error reads Fīrūzshāh here.

accompanied by the Imam al-Mu'ayyad al-Muwaffaqī al-Shāfi'i. We have mentioned previously the discord between the latter and Dhakhr al-Dīn, the syndic of the Alids, and his departure from Nishapur. After he had left, he joined al-Mu'ayyad [Ay-Aba] and came back to besiege Nishapur with him. The syndic of the Alids fortified himself within Shāhrastān (the Inner City). The situation was serious and hostilities continued a long time. Blood was shed and the veils of decency were rent. They destroyed any houses and other buildings that survived in Nishapur. The Shāfi'iś and their followers were extreme in the revenge they took. They demolished the Ṣandalīyya Madrasah, belonging to the adherents of Abū Hanīfa, and others too, and besieged the citadel (Quhandiz). This discord utterly ruined Nishapur.

Later al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba left for Bayhaq in Shawwāl 554 [16 October–13 November 1159]. These events involving the Oghuz that fell in the year 554 [1159] ought to be recorded under their own year. However, we have recorded them in advance here in order that their various items might follow one another and narrative continuity be improved.

[237] Account of Malikshāh's becoming ruler of Khuzistan

This year Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, took the land of Khuzistan, which he conquered from Shumla the Turkoman. This came about because Prince Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, after his return from the siege of Baghdad, as we have related, fell ill and remained sick in Hamadhan. His brother Malikshāh went to Qum and Qāshān and neighbouring lands and plundered them all. He extorted money from the inhabitants and collected large sums. His brother Muḥammad wrote to him, ordering him to stop this, so that he could make him his heir as ruler, but he did not comply. He went to Isfahan and when he drew near it, he sent an envoy to Ibn al-Khujandī and the city notables about the surrender of the city to him. They declined to do so and said, 'On our heads¹⁰ is an oath to your brother. We shall not betray him.' Thereupon Malikshāh embarked on a course of ill-treatment and extortion towards the people of the villages.

When Muḥammad Shāh heard the news, he marched from Hamadhan with Gird-Bāzū in charge of his advance guard. Malikshāh's bands dispersed and he fled towards Baghdad. Muḥammad Shāh did not pursue him because of his illness. Malikshāh camped at Qarmisīn, where he was joined by Quwaydān, who had parted from al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh and also made an agreement with Sunqur al-Hamadhānī. The two of them now joined forces with Malikshāh and encouraged him to attack Baghdad. Malikshāh left Khuzistan for Wāsiṭ and made camp on the east bank [of the Tigris]. They were in extreme hardship from hunger and the cold,

¹⁰ Literally 'our necks'.

and plundered the villages most shamefully. A dyke was breached in that region and many of them drowned. Malikshāh and some with him escaped with their lives and set out [238] for Khuzistan. Shumla prevented him from crossing the river, so Malikshāh sent messages to him asking him to be allowed to cross to his brother Prince Muḥammad Shāh, but this was not granted. At that juncture he wrote to the Lur Kurds who were there and invited them to join him. Delighted with his coming, a large host came down to him from the mountains there and offered him allegiance. He moved to a camp before Karkhayā and sought a battle with Shumla, who softened his response and said, ‘I will make the khutbah in your name and join you.’ However, this was not accepted and Shumla was compelled to fight. He gathered his army and marched against him. Malikshāh, along with Sunqur al-Hamadhānī, Quwaydān and other emirs, met him in battle. Shumla, defeated and with many of his men killed, went up into the castle of Dundarzīn. Malikshāh took the land, collected much money in taxes, although he showed justice, and then made his way to the land of Fars.

Account of the conflict between the Turkomans and the Ismā‘ilīs in Khurasan

In the region of Quhistan there was a group of Turkomans. A force of Ismā‘ilīs descended upon them from their fortresses, being about 1,700 strong. They fell upon the Turkomans but did not find the men, because they were absent from their tents. They plundered their flocks, seized the women and children and burnt what they were unable to carry away.

When the Turkomans returned and saw what had been done, they followed the tracks of the Ismā‘ilīs and caught up with them in the act of dividing the booty. With a shout of ‘God is great’ they charged them and put them to the sword, killing them at will. The Ismā‘ilīs fled but the Turkomans pursued them until, dead or captive, they were broken utterly. Only nine men escaped.

[239] Miscellaneous events

This year the Turkomans, followers of Barjam al-Īwā’ī, caused much disruption in the Uplands. An army was sent against them from Baghdad, commanded by Mankubars al-Mustarshidī. On his approach the Turkomans gathered together and they and Mankubars met and fought. The Turkomans suffered a terrible defeat. Some were killed and others taken prisoner. The heads and the captives were taken to Baghdad.

The Pilgrimage was performed this year and when the people came to Medina, the city of the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace), they received news that the Bedouin had gathered to surprise them. They left the [Pilgrimage]

route and followed the Khaybar road. They experienced severe hardship but escaped the Bedouin.¹¹

This year the following died:

The Shaykh Naṣr ibn Maṇṣūr ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abū'l-Qāsim al-Ḥarrānī, the druggist. He was born in Ḥarrān in the year 484 [1091–2]. He resided in Baghdad and his wealth and also his almsgiving were extensive. He used to read the Koran [frequently]. He was the father of Zahīr al-Dīn, who served as cadi in the reign of al-Mustadī' bi-Amr Allāh, as we shall relate, God willing.

Abū'l-Waqṭ 'Abd al-Awwal ibn Īsā ibn Shu'ayb al-Sijzī in Baghdad. He was from Sijistan by origin and brought up in Herat. He came to Baghdad in the year 552 [1157–8], with the intention of going on the Pilgrimage. People in Baghdad studied *The Genuine Collection (al-Ṣahīḥ)* of al-Bukhārī under him, for he had high authority as a transmitter. Because of that he delayed his pilgrimage. In this present year he planned to perform the ḥajj but died.

Yaḥyā ibn Salāma ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad, Abū'l-Faḍl al-Ḥaskafī, the litterateur, in Mayyafaraqin. He is the author of good poetry and excellent epistles that are renowned. He had Shī'ite sympathies. He was born in Ṭanza.¹² An example of his poetry is;

[240] How many a reprobate have I continued to blame,
While he considers my blaming a joke!
I say, 'Wine is an abomination',
He replies, 'It is far from being that!'
I say, 'Obscene things follow it.'
He says, 'The good things of life are in the obscene.'
I say, 'Vomiting follows from it.' 'Yes,' he says,
'It avoids the disgrace of the excrement's passage.'
'I shall give it up.' I say, 'When?'
He replies, 'When I am in the grave!'

¹¹ Ibn al-Jawzī participated in this Pilgrimage: at Medina 'we were told that the Bedouin had stationed themselves on the route to waylay the pilgrims. The guide led us on the Khaybar route, where I saw amazing mountains and other things' (*Muntaẓam*, x, 182).

¹² Born after 460/106, an 'extremist' Shi'ite, he died in Rabi' I/April 1158 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 183–8; *Wāfi*, xxviii, 149–54). Ṭanza was a small town near Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar (Yāqūt, iii, 551–2).

How ‘Abd al-Mu’min conquered the city of Mahdiyya from the Franks and took the whole of Ifrīqiya

We have mentioned under the year 543 [1148–49] how the Franks took the city of Mahdiyya from its ruler, al-Ḥasan [ibn ‘Alī] ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādīs al-Ṣanhajī, and we have also mentioned under the year 551 [1156–57] how the Franks killed and plundered the Muslims in Zawila, the neighbouring city of Mahdiyya. After the Franks had slain them and seized their property, several of them fled and made their way to ‘Abd al-Mu’min, lord of the Maghrib, who was in Marrakech, to seek his protection. When they arrived and entered into his presence, he received them honourably. They told him what had befallen the Muslims and that there was among the princes of Islam none they could appeal to but he and that only he could remove this affliction. Tears came to his eyes and he lowered his gaze. Then he raised his head and said, ‘Be of good cheer. I will aid you, although after a while.’

He ordered them to be given lodgings and granted them 2,000 dinars. Then he ordered the preparation of water skins and bottles, water tanks and everything needed by an army on the march. He wrote to all his lieutenants in the West – and he ruled nearly up to Tunis – ordering them to keep all the grain that was harvested, to leave it in the ear and store it in special places, and also to dig wells along the route. They did all that they were ordered. They gathered three years’ harvests and transferred it to depots, which they sealed with clay and which became like hills.

When it was Ṣafar of this year [22 February–22 March 1159] ‘Abd al-Mu’min left Marrakech. Most of his expeditions were [242] in Ṣafar. His destination was Ifrīqiya. One hundred thousand fighting men and the like number of camp-followers and traders gathered. His control of his troops was such that they marched among crops and not an ear of corn was damaged by them. When they camped, all prayed behind one imam with unanimous responses. Not a single person, whoever he might be, failed to join the congregation.

‘Abd al-Mu’min was preceded by al-Ḥasan ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādīs al-Ṣanhajī, who had been lord of Mahdiyya and Ifrīqiya. We have told the reason for his being with ‘Abd al-Mu’min. The latter continued his march until he came to the city of Tunis on 24 Jumādā II this year [13 July 1159], where was its ruler, [‘Alī ibn¹] Aḥmad ibn Khurasān. The fleet arrived at sea with seventy galleys,

¹ This addition is from Ibn Khaldūn, see Idris, *La Berbérie*, 388.

transports and supply vessels.² When he camped before the city, he sent to the inhabitants, summoning them to obedience, but they refused. The following day he attacked fiercely and the fall of the city and the entry of the fleet were imminent when a violent wind came which prevented the Almohads from entering. They withdrew to renew the fight the next morning and take the city.

At nightfall seventeen notables of the city descended to ‘Abd al-Mu’min to ask him for terms for the inhabitants. He granted them guarantees for their persons, their families and their wealth because they came quickly to accept his rule. To the rest of the inhabitants he would grant protection for their persons and their families, but make a levy upon them of half their money and their properties. The ruler of the city and his household should depart. This was settled and ‘Abd al-Mu’min took over the city. He sent people to prevent the troops from entering and also clerks to administer the levy on the people. He remained for three days and he offered Islam to the Jews and Christians resident there. Those who converted were left in peace but those who refused were put to death. The populace of Tunis remained there on payment of a tax on half the value of their dwellings.

[243] ‘Abd al-Mu’min departed for Mahdiyya, while the fleet shadowed him along the coast. He arrived on 18 Rajab [5 August 1159].³ At that time the scions of Frankish princes and their leading knights were in Mahdiyya, having abandoned Zawīla, which is a bow-shot distant from Mahdiyya. ‘Abd al-Mu’min entered Zawīla and it was filled with his troops and the [accompanying] tradespeople. In an hour it became a flourishing town. Those soldiers who did not have a place there camped outside. An untold number of the Ṣanhāja, Arab Bedouin and local people joined his force and they advanced to attack Mahdiyya as the days proceeded. However, there was no effect on the town because of its defensibility, the strength of its wall and the narrow front on which it could be assailed, as the sea encompassed most of it. It was like a hand in the sea with its wrist connected to the mainland.

The Franks were sending out their brave men to the flanks of the [Muslim] army, where they would do damage and then retire quickly. ‘Abd al-Mu’min ordered a wall to be built to the west of the city to stop their sallies, and the fleet surrounded it from the sea. ‘Abd al-Mu’min embarked on a galley with al-Hasan ibn ‘Alī, the former ruler, and sailed around the city. He was struck by how strong he saw it to be and realized that it could not be taken either by a land or sea assault and that there was nothing for it but to be patient. He said to al-Hasan, ‘How did you give up such a fortress?’ He replied, ‘Because of too few trusty men, lack of provisions and the decree of fate.’ ‘You are right’, he said and returned to land. He gave orders for the collection of corn and provisions and for the attacks to cease. Only a short time passed before two mountain-like heaps of wheat and barley

² For a discussion of this last type of vessel, the *shalandī*, see Agius, ‘The Arab Šalandī’.

³ Other sources suggest that 18 Rajab is a mistake, e.g. Tijānī, *Rihla*, 347 (quoting Ibn Shaddād) gives Wednesday 12 Rajab/= 29 July; cf. Idris, *La Berbérie*, 390.

appeared in the camp. Any person who came from afar to the camp used to say, 'When did these hills come into being here?' and they would be told, 'It's wheat and barley,' and they would be astonished.

The siege dragged on and during this time Sfax submitted to 'Abd al-Mu'min, as did the city of Tripoli, the Nefusa mountains, the forts of Ifrīqiya and neighbouring areas. He also took the city of Gabès by force and sent his son, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh with an army to conquer certain lands. Then the inhabitants of the city of [244] Gafsa, having seen the growth of 'Abd al-Mu'min's power, agreed to hasten to offer allegiance to him and to surrender the city. Its ruler Yahyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu'izz, accompanied by several of the local notables, set out to go to 'Abd al-Mu'min. When his chamberlain informed him of their arrival, 'Abd al-Mu'min said to him, 'You are surely mistaken. These are not the men of Gafsa.' The chamberlain replied, 'I am not mistaken.' 'Abd al-Mu'min continued, 'How can this be, since the Mahdi used to say, "Our followers will cut down the city's trees and demolish its walls." Nevertheless we shall accept their offer and spare them "in order that God may complete his foreordained plan"'.⁴ He sent a group of his men to them and a poet, one of their number, praised him with an ode which began like this:

No one swung his [strong] arms among the swords and the spears
As did the Caliph 'Abd al-Mu'min ibn 'Alī.

He rewarded him with one thousand dinars.

When it was 22 Sha'bān [8 September 1159] the king of Sicily's fleet arrived with 150 galleys, not including transports. It came from the Spanish island of Ibiza, whose population they had seized, made captive and carried away. The king of the Franks sent ordering them to go to Mahdiyya. They came on the date given above. When they drew near Mahdiyya, they lowered their sails to enter the harbour. 'Abd al-Mu'min's fleet came out to meet them and all the army mounted up and took station along the sea shore. The large number of troops that they saw horrified the Franks and fear entered their hearts. 'Abd al-Mu'min did not cease to rub his face in the dust, weep and pray for victory for the Muslims. Battle was joined at sea and the Frankish galleys turned away and re-set their sails. The Muslims pursued them and took seven of their galleys. Had they had sails [set], they would have taken most of them. It was a wonderful feat and 'a speedy victory'.⁵

The Muslim fleet returned victorious and triumphant and 'Abd al-Mu'min distributed the booty amongst his men. Thereupon the garrison of Mahdiyya despaired of relief but endured the siege for six months until [245] the end of the month of Dhū'l-Hijja [11 January 1160]. Then ten of the Frankish knights came down to 'Abd al-Mu'min and asked for a guarantee of the lives and property of the

⁴ Koran, viii, 42 and 44.

⁵ i.e. *fathān qarīban*. See Koran, lxviii, 18 and 27.

Franks within to leave the city and return to their own land. Their provisions were exhausted so that they had eaten their horses. He offered them Islam and called on them to accept it, but they did not respond. For several days they went backwards and forwards and won him over with their soft words, so he granted them their request. He gave them guarantees and provided them with ships on which they embarked and left.⁶ It was the winter and most of them drowned. Only a small number reached Sicily.

The king of Sicily had said, ‘If ‘Abd al-Mu’min kills our men in Mahdiyya, we shall kill the Muslims who are in the island of Sicily and seize their womenfolk and their property.’ However, God destroyed the Franks by drowning. Their rule in Mahdiyya had lasted twelve years.

‘Abd al-Mu’min entered Mahdiyya in Muḥarram on the morning of ‘Āshūrā’ in the year 555 [21 January 1160], which he called ‘the year of the fives’.⁷ He remained there for twenty days, organized its affairs and repaired the breaches in the wall. He brought stores into it, provisions, men and equipment. He left one of his men in charge and appointed alongside him al-Hasan ibn ‘Alī, the former ruler. He ordered that his counsel should be followed in all that was done and he assigned al-Hasan fiefs there and presented him with valuable properties for his place of residence. He did the same for his sons. ‘Abd al-Mu’min departed Mahdiyya at the beginning of Ṣafar this same year [11 February 1160] to go to the Maghrib.

Account of ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s harsh treatment of the Bedouin Arabs

When ‘Abd al-Mu’min had finished his task at Mahdiyya and planned to return to the west, he assembled the emirs of the Arabs, the Banū Riyāḥ, who were in Ifriqiya, and said to them, ‘It has become incumbent upon us to aid [246] Islam, for the infidels have greatly increased in power in Andalusia and gained control of much of the land that was in Muslim hands. No one fights them like you. It was through you that the lands were conquered at the beginning of Islam, and now it is through you that the enemy will be driven back. We want from you 10,000 horsemen, courageous and brave men, to wage Jihad on the path of God.’ ‘We hear and obey,’ they responded. He demanded that they swear by God Almighty and on the Koran, which they did. He marched with them as far as the pass of Mount Zaghwān.

There was among them a man called Yūsuf ibn Mālik, one of their emirs and

⁶ The Norman garrison capitulated on 10 Muḥarram 555/21 January 1160, see *EI*(2), v, 1247.

⁷ Properly ‘the fifths’, referring to the date and possibly the sultan’s fifth of the booty. Note that in *Muntazam*, x, 197, a prophetic dream is mentioned foretelling the end of al-Muqtāfi’s caliphate ‘when the three *kha’ṣ* unite’, meaning in the year 555, for which every word in Arabic begins with the letter *khā’ṣ*.

tribal leaders. He came to ‘Abd al-Mu’min at night and said to him secretly, ‘The Arabs disapprove of going to Andalusia. They say, “His aim is just to remove us from our lands.” They will not fulfil what they have promised.’ ‘Abd al-Mu’min said, ‘God (mighty and glorious is He) will destroy any traitor!’ On the following night they fled to their tribes and entered the desert. Only Yūsuf ibn Mālik remained, whom ‘Abd al-Mu’min dubbed ‘Yūsuf the Truthful.’

‘Abd al-Mu’min took no course of action against them but continued westward with all speed until he drew near Constantine. He camped at a fertile place called the Valley of the Women. It was spring and the grass was plentiful and good. He stayed there and put a watch on the roads. No one at all could leave the army. He remained like that for twenty days and throughout the land the people were left with no news of this army despite its numbers and great size. They said, ‘It is just some disturbing news he has received from Andalusia. Because of that he has been eager to press on.’ The Arabs who had fled from him returned from the desert to their lands when they felt they were safe from him, took up residence in their familiar areas and settled down.

When ‘Abd al-Mu’min learnt that they had returned, he sent his two sons, Abū Muḥammad and Abū ‘Abd Allāh, against them with 30,000 fighting men, the notables and champions of the Almohads. They travelled fast, crossed the wastes and, before the Arabs were aware, the army appeared suddenly in their rear from the direction of [247] the desert, to prevent their access to it if they attempted that.

They had camped south of Qayrawān at a mountain called Horn Mountain, being about 80,000 tents with their renowned chiefs, Abū Maḥfūz Muḥriz ibn Ziyād, Mas’ūd ibn Zimām, Jubāra ibn Kāmil and others. When the troops of ‘Abd al-Mu’min came into view, there was confusion and dissension. Mas’ūd and Jubāra ibn Kāmil fled with their tribal followers but Muḥriz ibn Ziyād held firm, ordering them to stand and fight. They paid no attention to him. However, he held his ground along with his Bedouin following. The Almohads opened hostilities in the middle third of Rabī‘ II [last third of April 1160]. Both sides stayed firm, the conflict was severe and many were killed. It came about that Muḥriz ibn Ziyād was slain and his head raised on a lance. At that, the Bedouin bands fled and gave up their tents, womenfolk, children and flocks. Everything was taken to ‘Abd al-Mu’min, who was at his previous site. He ordered the pure Arab women to be looked after and carried them under guard, well-treated and protected, to the Maghrib. He behaved towards them as he had behaved towards the womenfolk of the Athbaj.⁸

Later, deputations of Riyāḥ came to him, leaving their homes in search of their women, as the Athbaj had done. He showed them kindness and restored their women to them. There remained not a single one who did not join him and accept his authority, while he spread his protective wing over them and showed them his

⁸ Reference to events after the battle of Setif in 548/1153, see Idris, *La Berbérie*, 402, note 483; the text of *Kāmil* has ‘Abthaj’ in error.

liberality. Subsequently he dispatched them to the frontiers of Andalusia in accordance with the original arrangement. The bones of the Arabs killed at that battle were collected at the Horn Mountain and survived for a long time like a great hill, visible to the naked eye from a far distance. Under the deputies of ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn Ifrīqiya remained secure and peaceful, where no Arab emir was left in revolt against his rule other than Mas‘ūd ibn Zimām and his tribe on the fringes of his lands.⁹

How Baghdad was inundated

This year on 8 Rabī‘ II [29 April 1159] the Tigris rose greatly and breached the Qūraj above Baghdad.¹⁰ The rising water approached the city and filled the open country around and the city moat. The water undermined the wall and on Saturday 19 Rabī‘ II [=9 May] made an opening in it. Part of the wall collapsed and blocked it, but then the water made another opening, which they left alone in the belief that it would take the pressure off the wall, so that it would not fall [completely]. However, the water became overwhelming and it proved impossible to hold it back. It flooded Zafar’s Orchard,¹¹ al-Ajma, al-Mukhtāra, al-Muqtadiyya, Pitch Lane, Ibn Jarada’s Waste, al-Rayyān, the Cadi’s Orchard, part of al-Qaṭī'a, part of Azaj Gate, part of al-Ma'mūniyya, Abū'l-Shahm’s Orchard, part of Ibn Razīn’s Orchard and part of al-Zafariyya.

The water crept beneath the ground to certain sites which then collapsed. The inhabitants began to cross to the West Bank but the ferry tariff reached several dinars, which was beyond many. The waters went down but the city wall fell in ruins. The water which was within the city continued to creep in areas that it had never reached before. The destruction was immense. Quarters were left unrecognizable, as nothing more than mounds. People established the boundaries of their houses by guesswork.

As for the West Bank, the cemetery of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and other cemeteries were flooded. Solidly built tombs crumbled and the dead rose to the surface of the water. The same happened to the Shrine¹² and al-Harbiyya. It was a terrible disaster.¹³

⁹ For this section, see Idris, *La Berbérie*, 401–2.

¹⁰ al-Qūraj was a canal between al-Qātūl and Baghdad which, according to Yāqūt, iv, 198–9, was frequently the cause of inundations.

¹¹ According to Yāqūt, iv, 45–6, *qarāḥ* is a Baghdadi term meaning *bustān* ('orchard, plantation'), used as a topographical term for former orchards, subsequently developed. Yāqūt gives directions and relative locations for those listed in this passage and some of the other places (all on the East Bank). See also Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 289 and map VIII.

¹² The burial place of the celebrated ascetic and mystic Ma'rūf al-Karkhī (died 200/816) is probably intended; see Lassner, *Topography*, 286–7.

¹³ The source is *Muntazam*, x, 189–90. Ibn al-Jawzī's own home was flooded and 'we could tell the site of our street by the minaret of the mosque which did not fall'.

[249] Account of Sunqur al-Hamadhānī's return to al-Lihf and his defeat

This year Sunqur al-Hamadhānī returned to his fief, namely the castle of Māhkī and the town of al-Lihf. The caliph had assigned it to Emir Qāymāz al-'Amīdī, who had 400 cavalrymen with him. Sunqur sent to him, saying, 'Depart from my land.' He refused to do so, therefore Sunqur marched against him and a fierce battle followed in which al-'Amīdī was defeated, and he returned to Baghdad in a very bad state.

The caliph took the field and moved against Sunqur with his troops. Having reached al-Nu'māniyya, he sent the troops on with Turshuk and returned to Baghdad. As Turshuk proceeded in the direction of Sunqur al-Hamadhānī, the latter fled deep into the mountains. Turshuk plundered whatever property, arms and other things he found that belonged to him and his army. He captured his vizier and killed any of his men he saw. He came to Māhkī and besieged it for some days. Then he returned to al-Bandānjīn and sent a victory report to Baghdad.

Sunqur, however, joined Malikshāh and asked for his aid. He sent 500 horsemen with Sunqur, who returned and descended upon a fort there. His men caused chaos in the area, so Turshuk sent a request for help to Baghdad, which duly came. Sunqur wished to make a surprise attack on Turshuk but he learnt of this and took precautions. Sunqur turned to deceitful measures and sent a messenger to Turshuk asking him to repair his relations with the caliph. However, Turshuk detained the messenger and, with his lightly armed men, rode out and made a surprise attack on Sunqur by night. Sunqur and his men were defeated and great was the slaughter among them. Turshuk seized their goods and their mounts and all they had. Sunqur escaped wounded.

[250] Account of rioting among the common people of Astarābād

This year in Astarābād there was a serious outbreak of rioting between the Alids, along with those Shī'ites who followed them, and the Shāfi'īs with their followers. This came about because the Imam Muḥammad al-Harawī came to Astarābād and held preaching sessions. The cadi of the town was Abū Naṣr Sa'd ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-Nu'aymī, also a member of the Shāfi'ī school of law. The Alids with their Shī'ite followers rose up against the Shāfi'īs and their following in Astarābād and serious rioting ensued between both parties, in which the Alids proved victorious. Several of the Shāfi'īs were slain. The cadi was beaten and his house and those of his followers were plundered. There was no end to the dreadful things that afflicted them.

The Shāh of Māzandarān heard what had happened and was outraged. He disapproved of what the Alids had done and expressed this disapproval in extreme fashion, despite his being a strong Shī'ite. He cancelled the pensions he was paying them and imposed levies and financial exactions on the people at large. Many of

them went away to various places. The cadi resumed his office and the rioting subsided.

Account of the death of Sultan Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh

In Dhū'l-Ḥijja of this year [14 December 1159–11 January 1160] there died Sultan Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad, he who had besieged Baghdad in his quest for the sultanate and then withdrawn. He was stricken with chronic consumption. He died at the gates of Hamadhan. He was born in Rabī' II 522 [April 1128]. [251] When death was imminent, he ordered his troops to parade on horseback. He had his money, his jewels, concubines and mamlukes brought before him, gazed on them all from a balcony which dominated the scene and wept at what he saw. He said, 'These troops, possessions, mamlukes and concubines – I cannot see that they protect me a jot nor do they add a moment to my allotted span.' He ordered all to be removed after he had distributed much of it.

He was mild, generous and intelligent, very deliberate in all his action. He had a young son, whom he entrusted to Āqsunqur al-Āḥmadīlī, saying to him, 'I do not know that the army will obey such a young child. He is put in your charge. Take him away to your lands.' He went to Marāgha. After Muḥammad's death, the emirs quarrelled; one faction demanded his brother Malikshāh and another demanded Sulaymān Shāh and these were the majority. A further faction wanted Arslān who was with Īldikiz. Malikshāh set out from Khuzistan, accompanied by Dakalā, lord of Fars, and Shumla the Turkoman and others. He arrived at Isfahan, which was surrendered to him by Ibn al-Khujandī, who gathered money for him and spent it in his support. He sent to the troops in Hamadhan, asking them to obey him. They did not respond because of the lack of unanimity among them and because most of them were in favour of Sulaymān Shāh.

How Ḥarrān was taken from Nūr al-Dīn and then restored to him

During this year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Aleppo, fell seriously ill and there were rumours that he had died. He was in the citadel of Aleppo with his younger brother Amīr Amīrān, who assembled the elite and closely controlled the citadel. Shirkūh, Nūr al-Dīn's senior emir, was in Homs. A report of Nūr al-Dīn's death came to him, so he proceeded to Damascus to take control there. His brother Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, who was there, [252] censured him for this and said, 'You have destroyed us! Your best course is to return to Aleppo. If Nūr al-Dīn is alive, do obeisance to him immediately. If he is dead, then we are in Damascus and can do what we wish to take it over.' He returned to Aleppo with all speed, went up into the citadel and seated Nūr al-Dīn at a window where he could be seen and

speak to the people. When they saw him alive, they abandoned his brother Amīr Amīrān, who went to Harrān and took control there.

After his recovery Nūr al-Dīn went to Harrān to regain it. His brother fled and left his children in the citadel at Harrān. Nūr al-Dīn took it and handed it over to Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī, the lieutenant of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn, ruler of Mosul. After his taking Harran, Nūr al-Dīn went to Raqqā where were the sons of Amīrak al-Jāndār, one of the leading emirs. He had died and his sons had continued [in his place]. Nūr al-Dīn invested the city and several of the emirs interceded for them, which enraged Nūr al-Dīn. He said, ‘Why did you not intercede for the children of my brother when I took Harrān from them? Intercession on their behalf was something I would have welcomed more than anything!’ He did not accept their pleas and took away the city.

Miscellaneous events

This year the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh fell ill. After his illness had worsened he recovered and the celebratory drums were sounded at Baghdad. Alms were distributed on behalf of the caliph and the state magnates. The city was decorated¹⁴ for a week.

Turshuk came back to Baghdad.¹⁵ The first thing anyone knew of his arrival was when he prostrated himself below the Tāj, holding a sword and a shroud. He had rebelled against the caliph and associated himself with the ‘Ajāmīs. He now returned and was well received, allowed to enter the Caliphal Palace and given some money.

[253] In Jumādā I [21 May-19 June 1159] Muḥammad ibn Unur, ruler of Quhistan, sent a force to the lands of the Ismā‘ilīs to collect the tribute that was due from them. The Ismā‘ilīs came down from the mountains to attack them and killed many of the force and took prisoner the emir who was their commander, called Qayba, the brother-in-law of Ibn Unur. He remained a captive with them for several months, eventually gave his daughter in marriage to the chief of the Ismā‘ilīs, Alī ibn al-Hasan, and was released from captivity.

This year Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Abīl-Qāsim Maṇṣūr ibn Abī Sa‘d al-Ṣā‘idī, cadi of Nishapur, died during the month of Ramaḍān [16 September-15 October 1159]. He died at Rayy and was buried in the cemetery of Muḥammad ibn al-Hasan al-Shaybānī, the pupil of Abū Ḥanīfa (God be pleased with him). The cadi was also a Ḥanafī.¹⁶

¹⁴ Following the variant: ‘ulliqā.

¹⁵ According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 189, in Muḥarram/23 January-21 February 1159.

¹⁶ A member of the distinguished al-Ṣā‘idī family of cadis, see Bulliet, *Patricians of Nishapur*, 201-26.

Account of Sulaymān Shāh's move to Hamadhan

Early in this year [began 12 January 1160] Sulaymān Shāh travelled from Mosul to Hamadhan to be invested as sultan. We have already mentioned the reason why he had been arrested and taken to Mosul. The reason why he now went to Hamadhan is that, after the death of Prince Muḥammad, son of Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, the great emirs sent to Atabeg Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, the lord of Mosul, requesting him to send them Prince Sulaymān Shāh, the son of Sultan Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, so that they could invest him with the sultanate. An agreement was settled between them that Sulaymān Shāh should be sultan, Quṭb al-Dīn his atabeg, that Jamāl al-Dīn, Quṭb al-Dīn's vizier, should be vizier for Sulaymān Shāh and Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, the emir of the Mosul forces, should be commander of Sulaymān Shāh's army. They all swore to accept this and Sulaymān Shāh was equipped with large sums of money, campaign baggage, mounts, sovereign regalia and such like items fit for sultans. He then set out for Hamadhan with Zayn al-Dīn leading the Mosul army.

When they drew near the Uplands, troops came to join them in droves, a group and an emir meeting them every day, until a large force had gathered around Sulaymān Shāh. Zayn al-Dīn thought them a threat to himself because [255] he saw they had such sway over the sultan and showed such lack of respect as made his anxiety unavoidable. He therefore returned to Mosul. When he went back and left him, [Sulaymān Shāh's]¹ plans did not work out and he failed to achieve what he wished. The army arrested him at the gates of Hamadhan in Shawwāl 555 [October 1160] and made the khutbah for Arslān Shāh, son of Prince Ṭughril, whose mother was married by Īldikiz. This will be related in full detail, God willing.

The death of al-Fā'iz and the succession of al-'Āqid, both Alids

In Ṣafar of this year [11 February–10 March 1160] died al-Fā'iz bi-Naṣr Allāh Abū'l-Qāsim Īsā ibn Ismā'il al-Zāfir, ruler of Egypt. His caliphate lasted six years and about two months. He was five years old when he came to the throne, as we have related. When he died, al-Şāliḥ ibn Ruzzīk entered the palace and summoned

¹ The wording of *Bāhir*, 115, suggests more clearly that there is a change of subject here. This means that *Kāmil*'s date Shawwāl 556 given just below must be changed to 555, the present year. The date of the murder of Sulaymān Shāh is given as Rabī' II 556/April 1161.

a senior eunuch and said to him, ‘Who is there here fit for the caliphate?’ ‘There are several here,’ was the reply and he mentioned their names. One he mentioned was a man of some age. Al-Şāliḥ ordered him to be fetched, but one of his men said to him, ‘Do not let ‘Abbās be more prudent than you, in that he chose the young one and left the older ones, and so dominated affairs.’ So al-Şāliḥ sent the man back to where he was and then ordered al-‘Ādīd li-Dīn Allāh Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Ḥāfiẓ to be brought, whose father was never caliph. At that time al-‘Ādīd was a youth approaching maturity. Al-Şāliḥ saluted him as caliph and gave him his daughter in marriage. The dowry that she took with her was quite unparalleled. She lived on after the death of al-‘Ādīd and the transfer of sovereignty from the Alids to the Turks and married again.

[256] Account of the death of the Caliph al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh and a little about his reign

On 2 Rabī‘ I this year [12 March 1160] the Commander of the Faithful al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad, son of al-Mustazhir bi-Allāh Abū’l-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn al-Muqtadī bi-Amr Allāh (God be pleased with him) died from a stomach illness. He was born on 12 Rabī‘ II 489 [9 April 1096] and his mother was an *umm walad*² called Yā‘ī.³ His caliphate lasted twenty-four years, three months and sixteen days. He was like his father al-Mustazhir bi-Allāh with his abdominal illness⁴ and both died in Rabī‘ I.

He was mild, generous and just, a good ruler and a man possessed of much sense and intelligence. He was the first to take full control in Iraq, independently of any sultan alongside him, since the beginning of Buyid rule, and the first caliph to exercise the office fully and have authority over his troops and men since the time when the mamlukes came to dominate the caliphs from al-Mustanṣir onwards, except for al-Mu’taqid, who was brave, bold and personally engaged in military operations. He used to pay out large sums of money to intelligence agents throughout the land, so that nothing there would escape his notice.

The caliphate of al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh

This year al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh the Commander of the Faithful was proclaimed caliph after the death of his father. His name was Yūsuf and his mother was an

² Literally ‘mother of a child’, the term for a concubine freed after bearing her master a child.

³ Thus the edition, although a Ms. reads: Sitt al-Sāda Nuzha, an Abyssinian. Ibn al-‘Imrānī, 225, has ‘Sitt al-Sāda’.

⁴ The text reads ‘illat al-tarāqī, which should be emended to ‘illat al-marāqq, as in the account of al-Mustazhir’s illness, see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), 190, s.a. 512.

umm walad called Ṭā'ūs (Peacock).⁵ Al-Muqtafī had another concubine, who was the mother [257] of his son Abū 'Alī. When al-Muqtafī's illness worsened and she despaired of him, she sent to a number of the emirs and bestowed on them many fiefs and abundant cash to help her ensure that her son Emir Abū 'Alī became caliph. They said, 'What is to be done with the heir apparent?' She replied, 'When he visits his father, I shall arrest him.' Every day he used to visit his father. 'We must have,' they said, 'one of the leading state officials.' Their choice fell on Abū'l-Ma'ālī ibn Ilkiyā al-Harrāsī and they invited him into the plot. He agreed on condition that he would be vizier and they granted him his demand.

When the agreement had been reached and the mother of Abū ‘Alī informed, she summoned several slave girls to whom she gave daggers and ordered them to kill the heir apparent, al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh. The latter had a young eunuch whom he frequently used to send to learn the news of his father. He saw the slave girls with daggers in their hands and swords in the hands of Abū ‘Alī and his mother, so returned and told al-Mustanjid. She sent to tell al-Mustanjid that his father was close to death and that he should come and be present. Having summoned the major-domo, ‘Aḍud al-Dīn,⁶ and got him to accompany him along with a body of retainers, he entered the chamber, wearing a breastplate and armed with a sword. When he came in, the slave girls leapt at him. He struck one and wounded her, and likewise another. He cried out and the major-domo entered with the retainers. The girls fled. He seized his brother Abū ‘Alī and his mother and imprisoned them both. He captured the slave girls, executed some and drowned others. Thus God protected him.

When al-Muqtāfi li-Amr Allāh died, al-Mustanjid held a session for his formal proclamation. His household and his relatives swore allegiance to him as caliph, led by his uncle Abū Ṭālib, followed by his brother Abū Ja'far, who was older than al-Mustanjid. Next came the Vizier Ibn Hubayra, the chief cadi, the state officials and the ulema. On the Friday the khutbah was said in his name and dinars and dirhams were scattered around.

[258] The Vizier Ibn Hubayra related⁷ that al-Mustanjid said to him, 'I saw the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) in a dream fifteen years ago. He said to me, "Your father will continue as caliph for fifteen years." It was as he said. I then saw him four months before the death of my father al-Muqtafi. He took me through a great door and climbed to the top of a hill, where he prayed two *rak'as* with me. Then he put a robe upon me and said, "Say: O God, guide me with those whom You have guided aright," and he recited the prayer of humility.'⁸

After his accession he confirmed Ibn Hubayra as his vizier and also the other

⁵ He was born in Rabi' I 518/18 April-17 May 1124 (*Muntazam*, x, 192).

⁶ He was Abū'l-Faraj Muhammad ibn 'Abd Allāh, a descendant of the Vizier Ra'is al-Ru'asā' Ibn al-Muslima. He was killed by Bātinīs in 573/1178.

⁷ Ibn al-Jawzī seems to have heard this directly from the vizier (*Muntazam*, x, 192-3)

⁸ Arabic *dū'ā' al-qunūt*, the personal supplication during the formal prayer (*salāt*); see *EI*(2), v, 395, s.v. *kunūt*.

officials in their offices. He abolished uncanonical taxes and imposts and arrested the [former] cadi, Ibn al-Murakhkhim, saying, ‘He was a bad judge,’ and took much money from him.⁹ His books were seized and those that were concerned with the learning of philosophers were burnt in the square. These included *The Book of Healing [of the Soul]* of Avicenna,¹⁰ the *Book of the Brethren of Purity*¹¹ and such like. He advanced ‘Aḍud al-Dīn ibn Ra’īs al-Ru’asā’, who, as major-domo, was supporting him, and he ordered the vizier to stand when he entered. He dismissed Chief Cadi Abūl-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ahmad al-Dāmghānī and appointed in his place Abū Ja’far ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Thaqafī, to whom he gave a robe of honour.¹²

Account of the conflict between the army of Khwārazm and the Yazir Turks

In Rabī‘ I this year [11 March–9 April 1160] a detachment of the army of Khwārazm went to Ajāḥa and attacked Yaghmur Khān ibn Ūdak and the Yazir¹³ Turks who were his followers. They inflicted a severe defeat on them, killing many. Yaghmur Khān fled and sought out Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad Khān and the Oghuz Turks with him, appealing to them on grounds of kinship. Yaghmur Khān thought [259] that Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Ay-Tāq was the one who had stirred up the Khwārazmians against him, so sought help against him from the Oghuz.

Account of the situation of al-Mu’ayyad in Khurasan this year

Under the year 553 [1158–59] we have mentioned the return of al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba to Nishapur and his taking power there, which was in the year 554 [1159–60]. When this present year came and al-Mu’ayyad saw how established he was in Nishapur, his strong ruling position, the size of his army and regular cavalry, he acted with magnanimity to his subjects, especially the people of Nishapur, for he helped them back on their feet and was very liberal towards them. He embarked on the restoration of its districts and provinces. A detachment of his troops he sent to the region of Asqīl, where a band had rebelled and caused much disturbance and chaos in the country. They had persisted for a long time in their contumacy.

⁹ Ibn al-Murakhkhim was imprisoned and later died there (*Muntaẓam*, x, 194).

¹⁰ i.e. *Kitab al-Shifā'*, the major philosophical work of Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna; born 370/980, died 428/1037), see *EI*(2), iii, 941–7.

¹¹ Normally *The Epistles etc.* (*Rasā'il Ikhwān al-Ṣafā*), a compendium of knowledge with an Ismā‘ilī tendency, written in the period 350–75/961–86. See *EI*(2), iii, 1071–6.

¹² Ibn al-Athīr seems to have muddled his source, Ibn al-Jawzī, who relates that it was Chief Cadi al-Dāmghānī who was ordered to stand for al-Thaqafī. The latter died in this same year and was succeeded by his son Ja’far (*Muntaẓam*, x, 195 and 196).

¹³ Here and in the rubric the edition has al-B.r.ziyya. Cf. Bosworth, ‘The Iranian world’, 186.

Al-Mu'ayyad sent calling upon them to give up their wicked lawlessness and to return to obedience and righteousness. They did not accept this, nor refrain from their course of action. He therefore dispatched a large squadron against them, which fought them and made them taste the consequences of their deeds. Many of them were killed and their castles destroyed.

From Nishapur al-Mu'ayyad went to Bayhaq, where he arrived on 14 Rabī' II this year [23 April 1160]. There he attacked the castle of Khusrojird, a strong castle built by King Kaykhusro before he had succeeded in killing Afrāsiyāb. It was garrisoned by brave men, who resisted al-Mu'ayyad. He blockaded them and erected trebuchets to press the attack. The garrison held out until their endurance was exhausted. Then al-Mu'ayyad took the castle, expelled those within and installed men to hold it. He returned to Nishapur on 25 [260] Jumādā I [2 June 1160].

He then went to Herat but, having achieved nothing there, returned to Nishapur and moved against the town of Kundur, a dependency of Turaythīth. A man called Ahmad, who was a muleteer, had seized control of it and a band of rogues, brigands and malefactors gathered around him, who ruined much of the land, killed many folk and plundered more property than could be counted. The damage they caused to Khurasan was great and the hardship suffered increased.

Al-Mu'ayyad attacked them. They fortified themselves in a fortress they had, where they were fiercely engaged. Al-Mu'ayyad set up catapults and trebuchets, so this muleteer Ahmad submitted to his authority and agreed to be incorporated among his followers and supporters. He was warmly welcomed and treated with kindness and liberality.

Later he rebelled against al-Mu'ayyad and fortified himself in his castle but al-Mu'ayyad took it from him by force, fettered him and put a guard on him. Subsequently he put him to death and so relieved the Muslims of him, his evil and wickedness.

In the month of Ramaḍān [4 September–3 October 1160] al-Mu'ayyad marched to the region of Bayhaq, intending to bring war to it because the people had thrown off allegiance to him. When he drew near, a local ascetic came to him and pleaded with him to forgive them and overlook their faults, preaching to him and calling God to his remembrance. He responded to this and departed. Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad Khān sent to al-Mu'ayyad to recognize his position in Nishapur, Tūs and their districts and to grant him authority there. He returned to Nishapur on 4 Dhū'l-Qa'da [5 November 1160]. The population were delighted at the agreement to maintain al-Mu'ayyad in Nishapur, reached between him, Prince Maḥmūd and the Oghuz, to remove dissension and discord from the people.

[261] The conflict between the Shāh of Mazandaran and Yaghmur Khān

When Yaghmur Khān sought out the Oghuz and asked for their support and aid

against Ay-Tāq, in the belief that it was he who had encouraged the Khwārazmians to attack him, they agreed and set out with him on the road to Nasā and Abīward. They came to Emir Ay-Tāq, who could not himself find strength to deal with them. He requested help from the Shāh of Mazandaran and he came with a large contingent of Kurds, Dailamīs, Turks and Turkomans who lived in the regions of Abaskūn. Battle was joined and lasted a long time. Five times the Oghuz and the Yazir Turks fled from the Shāh of Mazandaran but regrouped again.

Emir Ay-Tāq was on the right wing of the Shah of Mazandaran. The Yazir Turks charged him, when they despaired of overwhelming the Shah's centre, and Ay-Tāq fled, followed by the rest of the army. The Shah of Mazandaran went as far as Sāriya and most of his troops were killed. It is related that a merchant provided shrouds for, and buried, 7,000 of these fallen.

Ay-Tāq made for Khwārazm in his flight and took up residence there. From the battle site the Oghuz moved to Dihistan, for the battle took place close by. They mined the wall there, overwhelmed the inhabitants and plundered them in the early days of the year 556 [1161]. After they had ruined Jurjan and scattered its population throughout the land, they then returned to Khurasan.

[262] Account of the death of Khusroshāh, lord of Ghazna, and the accession of his son.

In Rajab of this year [7 July–5 August 1160] Sultan Khusroshāh ibn Bahram Shāh ibn Mas'ūd ibn Ibrahīm ibn Mas'ūd ibn Maḥmūd ibn Sabuktakīn, lord of Ghazna, died. He was just, a good ruler to his subjects, a man devoted to the good and the doers of good. He used to favour the ulema, by being generous to them and paying attention to their words. His rule lasted nine years.

His son, Malikshāh, succeeded him.¹⁴ When he came to power, 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn, the king of the Ghūr, came down on Ghazna and put it under seige. The winter was severe with much snow. He was unable to stand it, so returned to his own land in Ṣafar of the year 556 [February 1161].

Account of hostilities between Ay-Tāq and Bughrātakīn

In the middle of Sha'bān [20 August 1160] there was a battle between Emir Ay-Tāq and Emir Bughrātakīn Buzghush al-Jārkānī. Ay-Tāq had moved against Bughrātakīn in the remote districts of Juwayn and plundered him, taking his flocks and all that he had – and he was a man of a great fortune and considerable wealth. Bughrātakīn fled from the region and left it without protection, so Ay-Tāq

¹⁴ The text here has dubious authority. Khusroshāh's successor was his son, Khusromalik (ruled 555–82/1160–86); see Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*, 123.

conquered it and became rich there; his personal power grew and his following became numerous. People flocked to him. Bughrātakīn, meanwhile, made contact with al-Mu'ayyad, lord of Nishapur, joined his company and was counted one of his men. Al-Mu'ayyad gave him a welcome reception.

[263] Account of the death of Malikshāh ibn Maḥmūd

In Isfahan this year¹⁵ Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh ibn Alp Arslān, died after being poisoned. This came about as follows. When his followers became numerous in Isfahan, he sent to Baghdad and demanded that they should cancel the khutbah for his uncle Sulaymān Shāh and make it in his name, and that they should re-establish things in Iraq as they had originally been, otherwise he would attack them. The Vizier 'Awn al-Dīn ibn Hubayra prepared a eunuch of his, who was close to him, called Aghlabak al-Kūharā'īnī, for a trip to the land of the 'Ajām, where he bought a slave-girl from the cadi of Hamadhan for 1,000 dinars and sold her to Malikshāh. He had arranged with her to poison him, having made her great promises. She fulfilled her task and gave him some poisoned cooked meat. He was found dead in the morning. The doctor came to Dakalā and Shumla and informed them that he had been poisoned. They realized that it was the slave-girl's doing. Arrested and beaten, she confessed. Aghlabak fled and came to Baghdad. The vizier was true to him and gave him all that had been agreed.

After Malikshāh's death, the people of Isfahan expelled all his men and made the khutbah for Sulaymān Shāh, whose rule was established in those regions. Shumla returned to Khuzistan, where he seized what Malikshāh had had control of.

Miscellaneous events

This year Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh ibn Shādī, the commander of the armies of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Syria, went on the Pilgrimage. This Shirkūh is the man who conquered Egypt. [264] An account of him will be given, God willing.

Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, the deputy of Quṭb al-Dīn, ruler of Mosul, sent an envoy this year to al-Mustanjid, apologizing for his offence in aiding Muḥammad Shāh in the siege of Baghdad and requesting permission to go on Pilgrimage. Yūsuf al-Dimashqī, the professor of the Niẓāmiyya, and Sulaymān ibn Qutlumush were sent to him to put his mind at rest as regards the caliph and to let him know that permission was granted. He therefore set out on Pilgrimage and visited the caliph, who received him generously and gave him a robe of honour.

¹⁵ In Rabi' I/11 March–9 April 1160 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 198).

The following died this year:

Qāymāz al-Arjuwānī, emir of the Pilgrimage. He fell from his horse, while playing polo. His brains flowed from his nostrils and ears and he died.¹⁶

Muhammad ibn Yahyā ibn ‘Alī ibn Muslim, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zabīdī, in Rabī‘ I [11 March–9 April 1160]. He was from Zabīd, a well-known city in Yemen, and came to Baghdad in the year 509 [1115–16] and used to ‘command the good and forbid the evil’. He was a grammarian and a preacher. He belonged to the circle of the Vizier Ibn Hubayra for a while. His death occurred in Baghdad.

¹⁶ In Sha‘bān/6 August–3 September 1160 (*Muntażam*, x, 196–7).

Account of disturbance at Baghdad

In Rabī' I this year [March 1161]¹ the Vizier Ibn Hubayra left his residence to go to the Dīwān, while his mamlukes were clearing the way for him. They wished to reinstate the gate of the Kamāliyya Madrasah in the Caliphal Palace, but the law students prevented them and pelted them with bricks. The vizier's men drew their swords with every intention of striking them, but the vizier stopped them and made his way to the Dīwān. The canon-lawyers wrote a report complaining of the vizier's men but the caliph ordered the lawyers to be disciplined with beatings and expelled from the palace precincts. The major-domo proceeded to impose their punishment although their professor, Shaykh Abū Ṭālib, went into hiding. In the end the vizier gave every student² a dinar, asked their pardon and allowed them back in the madrasah. Their professor came out of hiding.

The death of Turshuk

During these days a group of Turkomans attacked al-Bandanījīn. The caliph ordered troops to be equipped and that their commander should be Emir Turshuk. The town of al-Lihf lay in his fief. The caliph sent to summon him but he refused to come to Baghdad, saying, 'Let the troops come and I shall fight with them', although he had treachery in mind. The troops were duly equipped and sent off to him, several emirs being amongst them. On meeting Turshuk they put him to death and sent [266] his head to Baghdad. He had killed a mamluke of the caliph, who called the murdered man's kin³ to him. They were told, 'On behalf of your father the Commander of the Faithful has exacted retaliation on the person who killed him.'

Account of the killing of Sulaymān Shāh and the khutbah in Arslān's name

In Rabī' II [April 1161] Sultan Sulaymān Shāh, son of Sultan Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, was killed. This came about as follows. There was rashness and folly

¹ According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 199, on Saturday 18 Rabī' I/= 18 March. Perhaps this was connected with the vizier's move on Friday 3 Rabī' I/= 3 March from his house alongside the Dīwān to the residence of the former vizier, Ibn Ṣadaqa.

² Reading *faqīh* rather than the edition's *faqīr* (poor man, sufi). The source, *Muntaẓam*, has simply *kull wāhid* (everyone).

³ In Arabic *awliyā'*, the near relatives with the right to demand retaliation or blood-money.

in his character and his winebibing came to such a pitch that he drank in daylight during Ramadān. He used to gather buffoons and pay no attention to the emirs. The troops neglected their duties and began to avoid parades. He had handed all affairs to Sharaf al-Dīn Gird-Bāzū the Eunuch, one of the chief eunuchs in Saljuq service, who paid attention to religion, good-sense and competent administration. The emirs often complained to him and he would calm them down.

It happened that one day Sulaymān Shāh had a drinking session in his pavilion outside Hamadhan. Gird-Bāzū came to him and reprimanded him for his conduct. Sulaymān Shāh ordered the buffoons who were present with him to make sport with Gird-Bāzū. One of them even revealed his private parts to him, so Gird-Bāzū left in a rage. When Sulaymān Shāh sobered up, he sent his apologies which Gird-Bāzū accepted. However, he avoided being in his presence. Sulaymān wrote to Inānch, ruler of Rayy, asking him to aid him against Gird-Bāzū. His messenger arrived when Inānch was ill, but the reply was sent, ‘When I recover from my illness, I will come to you with my army’. Gird-Bāzū heard of this and became more and more alienated. Sulaymān sent to him [267] one day, asking for him. He replied, ‘When Inānch comes, I will attend’, and he summoned the emirs and asked them to swear to obey him, for they hated Sulaymān. They duly swore and the first thing he then did was to kill Sulaymān’s fools, claiming ‘I do this only to preserve your rule’. They later arranged a truce and Gird-Bāzū gave a great banquet which the sultan and the emirs attended. Once Sultan Sulaymān Shāh was in his house, Gird-Bāzū seized him and his vizier Abū'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ḥāmidī, and their followers in Shawwāl 555 [October 1160]. He put the vizier and his close staff to death and imprisoned Sulaymān Shāh in a castle. Later he sent someone to strangle him. It is reported that he imprisoned him in the house of Majd al-Dīn al-'Alawī, the headman of Hamadhan, and that he was killed there. It is also said that his death was by poison. God knows best!

Gird-Bāzū sent to Īldikiz, lord of Arrān and most of the land of Azerbayjan, inviting him to come to him, so that he could make the khutbah for Prince Arslān Shāh who was with him. This reached the ears of Inānch, lord of Rayy, who set out, plundering on the way, and came to Hamadhan. Gird-Bāzū took refuge behind the walls and Inānch demanded that he give him a pitched battle. He replied, ‘I will not fight you until the Great Atabeg Īldikiz arrives’. Īldikiz set out with all his forces, more than 20,000 cavalry, bringing with him Arslān Shāh ibn Ṭughril ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, and came to Hamadhan, where he was met by Gird-Bāzū and lodged in the royal palace. Arslān Shāh was proclaimed sultan in the khutbah in those lands.

Īldikiz had married Arslān Shāh’s mother and she bore him Pahlawān. Īldikiz was Arslān Shāh’s atabeg and Pahlawān was Arslān Shāh’s chamberlain and half-brother. Īldikiz was one of the mamlukes of Sultan Mas'ūd, purchased by him at the beginning of his career. When he became sultan, he gave him Arrān and part of Azerbayjan as a fief. Wars and dissension followed and [at that time] he had with him no [268] Saljuq sultan. His position grew in importance and his power

increased, until eventually he married the mother of Prince Arslān Shāh and she bore him sons, among them Pahlawān Muḥammad and Qizil Arslān ‘Uthmān.

We have already mentioned how it came about that Arslān Shāh was transferred to him.⁴ He stayed with him until this present time. After the khutbah was made in his name at Hamadhan, Īldikiz sent to Baghdad requesting the khutbah for Arslān Shāh there too and that arrangements should be returned to what they had been in the days of Sultan Mas’ūd. His envoy was mistreated and sent back to him in a very bad state. As for Inānch, lord of Rayy, Īldikiz opened friendly contacts with him, they came to terms and swore to cooperate. Pahlawān’s marriage to Inānch’s daughter was arranged and she was brought to him at Hamadhan.

Account of hostilities between Ibn Āqsunqur and the troops of Īldikiz

When peace was made between Īldikiz and Inānch, an envoy was sent to Ibn Āqsunqur al-Āḥmadīlī,⁵ lord of Marāgha, calling on him to present himself to do obeisance to Sultan Arslān Shāh. He rejected this and said, ‘If you do not leave me alone – well, I have a sultan too.’ In his care was a son of Muḥammad Shāh ibn Maḥmūd, as we have mentioned. The Vizier Ibn Hubayra had corresponded with Ibn Āqsunqur about making the khutbah for Muḥammad Shāh’s son.⁶ When Īldikiz prepared an army with his son Pahlawān, news of it reached Ibn Āqsunqur, so he sent to Shāh Arman,⁷ lord of Khilāt, gave him his oath and they became united. Shāh Arman sent him a large army and apologized that he himself would be delayed because he was on a frontier that he could not abandon.⁸ Ibn Āqsunqur was greatly strengthened by them and his following grew numerous. He marched towards Pahlawān and they met at the Safid Rūd [White River] where a fierce battle occurred. [269] Pahlawān suffered a terrible defeat and he and his troops arrived at Hamadhan in a dreadful condition. Most of his men sought terms from Ibn Āqsunqur who returned victorious to his lands.

Conflict between Īldikiz and Inānch

After Malikshāh, son of Sultan Maḥmūd, died, as we have mentioned, a group of

⁴ See above p. [196].

⁵ The son of Āqsunqur I was either another Āqsunqur (II) or Arslān. The *nisba* Āḥmadīlī reflected the fact that Āqsunqur I had been a mamluke of Aḥmadīl ibn Ibrāhīm of Tabriz (died 510/1116), one of the Rawwādids (see Bosworth, ‘The Iranian world’, 170; *EI*(2), i, 300–301).

⁶ The edition and *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 177 have ‘Maḥmūd Shāh’ with ‘Muḥammad’ as a variant, as in Ms. Pococke 346, fol. 146a.

⁷ This holder of this title was Sukmān ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sukmān al-Quṭbī.

⁸ See the section below p. [278].

his followers took his son Maḥmūd and led him towards Fars. Its ruler Zankī ibn Dakalā⁹ moved to meet them, took Maḥmūd from them and left him in the castle of İştakhr. When İldikiz and Sultan Arslān Shāh who was with him took control of the lands and İldikiz sent to Baghdad requesting the khutbah for the sultan, ‘Awn al-Dīn Abū'l-Muẓaffar Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra, the caliph’s vizier, began to stir up the provincial rulers against him. He wrote to al-Aḥmadilī and we have related what happened. He also made contact with Zankī ibn Dakalā, ruler of Fars, offering to make the khutbah for the prince he controlled, that is, [Mahmūd] the son of Malikshāh, although he made the making of the khutbah in his name depend on his overcoming İldikiz. Thereupon Ibn Dakalā had the khutbah pronounced for the prince he held, brought him out of the castle and had the five-fold drum music performed before his residence. He gathered his forces and wrote to Inānch, ruler of Rayy, asking him to cooperate with him.

İldikiz heard of this and also called up and gathered troops. His standing force and his levies were numerous, amounting to 40,000. He came to Isfahan, making for Fars, and sent to Zankī ibn Dakalā asking him to cooperate in restoring the khutbah for Arslān Shāh, but this was refused. Zankī said, ‘The caliph has assigned his lands to me as fief and I shall march against him.’ İldikiz moved on [from Isfahan] and was informed that nearby was a herd of horses at pasture [270] belonging to Arslān Būqā, one of Zankī’s emirs, whose fief included Arrajān. He took a squadron to raid it. It chanced that Arslān Būqā had decided to change the horses he had because they were weak and take some replacements from that herd. On his way there he encountered the troops that İldikiz had sent to take his mounts. In the battle that followed he overwhelmed and killed them, sending their heads to his lord. This was reported to Baghdad and reinforcements asked for, which were promised.

The Vizier ‘Awn al-Dīn had also written to the emirs with İldikiz, remonstrating with them for their obedience to him, calling them weak-minded and urging them to aid Zankī ibn Dakalā and Inānch. The latter had left Rayy at the head of 10,000 horse and Ibn Āqsunqur al-Aḥmadilī sent him 5,000. Ibn al-Bāzdār, lord of Qazwin, Ibn Tughyuruk and others fled and joined Inānch when he was in the open country around Sāveh.

İldikiz consulted his advisers and they suggested that he should attack Inānch because he was the more important. He set out to do this but Zankī ibn Dakalā sacked Shimīrum¹⁰ and other places, so İldikiz sent back an emir with 10,000 horse to guard his lands. Zankī moved towards them, met and fought them. İldikiz’s troops returned to him defeated and he, undeterred, sent for the troops of Azerbayjan, who came to him with his son Qizil Arslān.

⁹ This Zankī was one of a line of atabegs in Fars, who ruled for the second half of the twelfth century and most of the thirteenth; see *EI*(2), viii, 978–9, s.v. Salghurids. It is uncertain whether his predecessor Sunqur (d. 556/1161) was his father or his brother. Note that Dakalā (Degele) was also the name of a son of Zankī who succeeded him in 570/1175.

¹⁰ Correct the text’s reading. See Krawulsky, 313.

Zankī ibn Dakalā sent a large force to Inānch, apologizing for not coming in person because he feared for his lands from Shumla, lord of Khuzistan. Īldikiz proceeded towards Inānch and the two armies drew near one another. They met on 9 Sha‘bān [3 August 1161] and a great battle took place which ended with the flight of Inānch. The rout was terrible. His men were killed and his baggage plundered. [271] He himself came to Rayy and fortified himself in the castle of Ṭabarak. After besieging Rayy, Īldikiz opened peace talks and agreed to the proposals that Inānch made. He gave him Jarbādaqān¹¹ and other places and then returned to Hamadhan.

This section and the preceding one should come later but they have been placed earlier to follow on from those that are connected with them.

The death of the ruler of the Ghūr and the accession of his son Muhammad

In Rabī‘ II of this year [April 1161] Prince ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī, ruler of the Ghūr, died after his departure from Ghazna. He was a just man and one of the best rulers of his people. After his death his son Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad succeeded and the people obeyed and loved him. A number of propagandists of the Ismā‘īlīs had come to his lands and gained a numerous following. They were expelled from all those regions and not one of them was left there. He made diplomatic contact with other rulers and gave them gifts. He sought to win over al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba and asked for his cooperation.

Account of disturbances at Nishapur and its destruction

Troublemakers and wicked men at Nishapur had become eager to plunder property and destroy dwellings. They did whatever they wanted and when ordered to desist took no notice. At this present time al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba ordered the arrest of the notables of Nishapur, including the Syndic of the Alids Abū'l-Qāsim Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥusaynī and others. He imprisoned them during Rabī‘ II 556 [April 1161], saying, ‘You are the ones who have incited the ruffians and troublemakers to do these [272] deeds. If you had wanted to stop them, they would have stopped.’

He put to death several of the wicked but Nishapur had been completely destroyed. Among the places destroyed was the Mosque of ‘Uqayl, which was a gathering place of the learned, where there was a library of endowed books. It was one of the greatest assets of Nishapur. Also ruined were eight Ḥanafī madrasahs and seventeen Shāfi‘ī madrasahs. Five libraries were burnt down and seven libraries were sacked and their books sold at trifling prices. This is what can be accounted for, not to mention all that was not recorded.

¹¹ The Arabic name for Golpāyegān, N.W. of Isfahan on an upper tributary of River Qum (Krawulsky, 256; Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 210).

Account of the deposition of Sultan Maḥmūd and the sack of Tūs and other places in Khurasan

Sultan Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad Khān was the nephew of Sultan Sanjar and we have already mentioned that he succeeded him after his death. In Jumādā II this year [June 1161] he besieged al-Mu’ayyad, lord of Nishapur, in Shādyākh. The Oghuz were with Sultan Maḥmūd and the conflict continued until the end of Sha’bān this year [23 August 1161].

Maḥmūd put out that he wanted to visit the bath-house. He entered the Shahristan at the end of Sha’bān, like a man in flight from the Oghuz. They remained camped around Nishapur until the end of Shawwāl [21 October 1161] but then withdrew, causing havoc and plundering various settlements. They sacked Tūs most shamefully, came to the shrine where ‘Alī ibn Mūsā¹² is buried and killed and robbed many people there but did no damage to the mausoleum where the tomb is.

[273] After Sultan Maḥmūd entered Nishapur, al-Mu’ayyad left him alone until it was Ramadān of the year 557 [began 14 August 1162]. Then he seized and blinded him and took the money, jewels and precious objects that he had. He used to keep them hidden, fearing that the Oghuz would take them, when he was with them. Al-Mu’ayyad suppressed the khutbah in his name at Nishapur and in other places he controlled and had his own name added after the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh. He also seized his son, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad whom the Oghuz had made their ruler before his father, as we have mentioned,¹³ and blinded him too. He imprisoned them both with their slave-girls and their retinue. It was not long before Sultan Maḥmūd died and then his son followed him because of his intense grief at the death of his father. God knows best!

Account of the restoration of Shādyākh at Nishapur

Shādyākh was built by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Tāhir ibn al-Husayn¹⁴ when he was emir over Khurasan for al-Ma’mūn. It came to be built because he saw a beautiful woman leading a horse, intending to take it to water. He asked about her husband and she told him about him. He summoned the husband and said to him, ‘Looking after horses is more a man’s job. Why do you sit at home and send your wife with your horse?’ The man wept and said, ‘Your harsh doings bring us to this.’ ‘How so?’ he asked. He replied, ‘Because you billet your soldiery on us in our houses. If I and

¹² ‘Alī (died 203/818), called al-Riḍā (the Acceptable One), son of Mūsā al-Kāzim, was the eighth of the Twelver Shiīte Imams; see *EI*(2), i, 399–400.

¹³ See above p. [232].

¹⁴ Son of the founder of the Tahirid dynasty (flourished ninth century AD), provincial governors for the Abbasid caliphs, see *EI*(2), x, 104–5.

my wife go out, the house is left empty and a soldier will take our possessions. If I water the horse, I cannot be sure that my wife is safe from the soldier. I therefore decided that I should stay at home and my wife look after the horse.' 'Abd Allāh was upset at this and left the town immediately and lodged in tents. He ordered the troops to leave the people's houses and built Shādyākh as a residence for himself and his troops, where he dwelt along with them. At a later date it fell into disrepair.

[274] When the reign of Sultan Alp Arslān came, this story was told him and he ordered the place to be restored. Later on it fell into disrepair again but at this present time when Nishapur was ruined and could not be preserved, while the Oghuz were ravaging and plundering the lands, al-Mu'ayyad ordered its wall to be built up, the breaches to be repaired and that it should be made habitable. He and others moved into it and at that time Nishapur comprehensively fell into ruin and was no longer inhabited.

The death of al-Şāliḥ ibn Ruzzīk and the vizierate of his son Ruzzīk

This year in Ramadān [24 August–22 September 1161] al-Malik al-Şāliḥ Abū'l-Ghārāt Ṭalā'i ibn Ruzzīk the Armenian, vizier of al-'Āḍid the Alid, ruler of Egypt, was killed. The reason for his death was that he had secured a firm hold on power, monopolized every aspect of authority and the collection of taxes because of al-'Āḍid's young years and because he was the one who had installed him. He provoked people, for he expelled many notables and dispersed them about the country to be safe from any coup. He married his daughter to al-'Āḍid and so turned the ladies of the palace against him. Al-'Āḍid's aunt sent money to the Egyptian emirs and called on them to murder him.

The most determined on that course was a man called Ibn al-Rā'i. Eventually they waylaid him in a palace passage and as he came in they struck him with daggers, taking him by surprise, and wounded him fatally. However, he was carried to his residence, still alive. He sent to al-'Āḍid, castigating him for his complicity in his murder despite all he had done during his caliphate. Al-'Āḍid swore that he had no knowledge of it and had not sanctioned it. Al-Şāliḥ said, 'If you are innocent, hand over your aunt, so that I can have revenge on her.' The caliph ordered her arrest and sent men who took her by force. She was brought to al-Şāliḥ and killed. He named as the next vizier his son [275] Ruzzīk, who was given the title al-'Ādil.¹⁵ Power was transferred to him after the death of his father.

Al-Şāliḥ was the author of some excellent, eloquent verses, proof of ample culture. An example is these verses of self-glorification:

God was adamant that our age should endure
And that glory and victory should serve us in our rule.

¹⁵ i.e. the Just.

We know that money's thousands come to nothing
While reward and fame remain ours when that is gone.
We have mixed generosity with strength, as though we
Are a cloud where lightning, thunder and raindrops are present.
When we go to war our hospitality watches us
And among our guests are the jackal and the vulture,
Just as in time of peace we bestow our liberality
And the slave and the free feed fully on our bounty.

It is a long poem.

Al-Şāliḥ was a noble, cultured man and a good poet. The learned were well regarded by him and he used to send them considerable rewards. He heard that Shaykh Abū Muḥammad ibn al-Dahhān the Baghdad grammarian who resided in Mosul had commented on a verse of his poetry, namely the following:

My ears avoid what slanderers say.
I have gained an occupation that distracts from war.

He prepared a splendid gift to send to him but he was killed before it could be sent.

He also heard that a man, a notable of Mosul, had praised him in Mecca, so he sent him a letter of thanks, along with a present.

Al-Şāliḥ was an Imāmī; he did not follow the doctrines of the Egyptian [Fatimid] Alids. When al-Ādīd was installed as caliph, a huge commotion assailed al-Şāliḥ's ears. He asked, 'What is happening?' He was told, 'They are celebrating the caliph.' 'I can just imagine these ignoramuses,' he said, 'saying "The previous one did not die until he had appointed this successor." They do not know that a while ago I was reviewing them just like sheep.'

[276] 'Umāra¹⁶ said, 'I went to visit al-Şāliḥ three days before he was killed. He handed me a sheet of paper on which were two verses of his poetry, as follows:

We are lost in distraction and slumber, but
Death has wakeful eyes that never sleep.
We have travelled towards death for years.
Would that I knew when death will come.

That was the last time I met him.'

'Umāra also said, 'It was a strange coincidence that I recited an ode to his son, in which I say the following:

Your father is the one by whose sword fate conquers
And you are his right hand when he conquers and his left.

¹⁶ 'Umāra (515-69/1121-74), Yemeni author and panegyrist of the Fatimids who was executed by Saladin (see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, ii, 792-3).

His great position, even if his life is long,
 Will certainly come to you and be your prize.
 It steals a chaste regard at you from behind
 A noble veil (may it not cease) and curtains.

Three days later power passed to him.'

Conflict between the Arabs and the standing army of Baghdad

In the month of Ramaḍān [24 August–13 September 1161] the Khafāja gathered at Ḥilla and Kufa and demanded their regular dues of food, dates and other things.¹⁷ The Emir of the Pilgrimage Arghush, who was the fief-holder of Kufa, denied them and the Emir Qayṣar, the prefect of Ḥilla, agreed with him in this action. They were both mamlukes of the caliph. The Khafāja rioted and plundered the agricultural hinterland of Kufa and Ḥilla. Emir Qayṣar, prefect of Ḥilla, moved against them with 280 cavalry and Arghush joined him [277] with his armed troop. Khafāja withdrew in face of them and were pursued by the troops as far as Syrian Raḥba. They sent excuses, saying, 'We have been putting up with camels' milk and barley bread, while you deny us our fixed allowances' and they asked for peace. Argush and Qayṣar did not respond to their offer.

Many Arabs had gathered with Khafāja and they drew up their lines and gave battle. The Arabs sent a detachment to the tents and baggage train of the troops whom they cut off from them. After a formidable charge by the Arabs the troops were routed and many of them killed, including Emir Qayṣar. Several others were taken prisoner and the Emir of the Pilgrimage was severely wounded. He entered Raḥba, whose emir protected him, procured him a safe conduct and sent him to Baghdad. Those who escaped [the Arabs] died of thirst in the desert.

The Arabs' slave-girls went out with water, offering drinks to the wounded. Any troops who asked for some they dispatched. There was much weeping and wailing for the dead in Baghdad. The Vizier ‘Awn al-Dīn Ibn Hubayra and his troops equipped themselves and set out in search of the Khafāja but they entered the desert and emerged at Basra. After they had taken to the desert, the vizier returned to Baghdad. The Banū Khafāja sent their excuses as follows: 'We have been badly treated. We abandoned our lands but they pursued us and we were forced to fight.' They asked for pardon and this was granted.

Account of al-Mu’ayyad’s siege of the Shahristan

This year al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba besieged the [inner] city of Shahristan next to

¹⁷ In question are the government subsidies for the Bedouin to assure the peaceful passage of the pilgrim caravans.

Nishapur and fought the inhabitants. He erected trebuchets and catapults. The inhabitants held out, fearing for their lives from al-Mu'ayyad. With the latter was Jalāl al-Dīn al-Mu'ayyad al-Muwaffaqī, the Shāfi'i lawyer, who, while on horseback, [278] was hit by a stone from a trebuchet and killed on 5 Jumādā II [1 June 1161]. The missile went beyond him and killed a shaykh of Bayhaq. The death of Jalāl al-Dīn was a great disaster for the men of religious learning, especially the Sunni orthodox. He (God have mercy on him) was in the prime of his life when he was killed.

The siege lasted until Sha'bān 557 [25 July–22 August 1162]. The lord there, Khwājikī, surrendered after many deaths and a long blockade. This fortress had three chiefs, who were in full control and were the ones who held and fought for it. One of them was this Khwājikī. The second was Dā'ī ibn Muḥammad, the nephew of Ḥarb al-'Alawī, and the third al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī Ṭālib al-'Alawī al-Fārisī. All of them surrendered to al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba, along with their partisans and followers. As for Khwājikī, it was established that he had wilfully murdered his wife and taken her property and he was executed for that. Al-Mu'ayyad took undisputed control of the Shahristan, which was plundered by his troops, although they did not kill or enslave a single woman.

How the king of the Georgians conquered the city of Ānī

In Sha'bān of this year [25 July–22 August 1162] the Georgians gathered with their king and marched to the city of Ānī in Arrān, which they conquered, killing a great multitude there. Shāh Arman [Sukmān] ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sukmān, the lord of Khilāt, undertook to oppose them and assembled his troops. A large host of volunteer warriors flocked to him. They set out and after meeting in battle the Muslims were defeated and most of them slain and many taken prisoner. Shāh Arman withdrew vanquished and out of his army no more than four hundred cavalrymen returned with him.

[279] How 'Īsā became ruler of Mecca (may God Almighty protect her)

This year the Emir of Mecca was Qāsim ibn Fulayta ibn Qāsim ibn Abī Hāshim al-'Alawī al-Ḥusaynī. When he heard that the pilgrims had arrived near Mecca, he extorted money from the pious persons in residence (*mujāwirīn*) and the local notables, taking much of their wealth, and fled from Mecca in fear of the Emir of the Pilgrimage Arghush.

This year the commander of the Mosul army, Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Baktakīn, went on pilgrimage, accompanied by a sizeable detachment of his troops. When the Emir of the Pilgrimage arrived at Mecca, he installed in place of Qāsim ibn Fulayta his uncle 'Īsā ibn Qāsim ibn Abī Hāshim and that remained his situation

until the month of Ramaḍān [24 August–22 September 1161]. Then Qāsim ibn Fulayta assembled a large contingent of Arabs whom he enthused with [the promise of] some money he had in Mecca. They followed him and he set out with them for Mecca. When his uncle ‘Isā heard this, he abandoned the town. Qāsim entered and remained there as emir for several days but he had no money to hand over to the Arabs. He then killed one of his officers, a man of excellent conduct. His men’s attitude towards him changed and they made contact with his uncle ‘Isā, who came to them. Qāsim fled and went up into Mount Abū Qubays, where he fell from his horse and was seized and killed by ‘Isā’s men. ‘Isā was dismayed by his killing, took his body, washed it and buried him in al-Mu‘allā by his father Fulayta. ‘Isā became firmly established in power. God knows best!¹⁸

Miscellaneous events

During this year ‘Abd al-Mu‘min, ruler of the Maghrib, set out for Gibraltar, which is on the coast of the straits on the Andalusia side. He crossed over the straits and built a strong city there, where he resided for a number of months. He then returned to Marrakech.

[280] In Muḥarram this year [January 1161] there came to Nishapur a large gathering of Turkomans of Fars, bringing with them many sheep for trade. They sold them, received the money for them and, having left, camped two stages away from Ṭabas Kīlakī.¹⁹ As they slept there, the Ismā‘īlīs descended upon them in a surprise attack at night and put them to the sword. They killed most of them and only the odd fugitive escaped. The Ismā‘īlīs seized as booty all the money and belongings that were with them and retired to their castles.

In most lands there was a heavy rainfall this year, especially in Khurasan. There the rains continued without a break from 20 Muḥarram to the middle of Ṣafar [19 January–13 February 1161]. In that period people did not see any sun.

This year there was fighting between the Georgians and Prince Ṣaltuq ibn ‘Alī, lord of Erzerum, in which Ṣaltuq and his troops were defeated and he was taken prisoner. His sister Shāh Bānwār had married Shāh Arman Sukmān ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sukmān, lord of Khilāt. She sent a present of great value to the king of the Georgians and requested him to take it as a ransom for her brother. He was freed and resumed his position as ruler.

This year the Frankish ruler of Sidon sought out Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, ruler of

¹⁸ According to *Wāfi*, xxiv, 146, Emir Qāsim died in either 556/1161 or 557/1162. Ziriklī, *A‘lām*, 787, names him as al-Qāsim ibn Hāshim ibn Fulayta and states that he became emir in 549/1154–5, was driven out by ‘Isā in 553/1158 and returned for a while in 557/1162, when he was killed, as described.

¹⁹ Correct *Kāmil*’s reading: Ṭābas Kankalī. This town and fortress in Quhistan, 7 days’ journey east of Yazd, on the edge of the Great Desert, was also known as Ṭabas al-Tamr (Krawulsky, 131; Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 359–60).

Syria, to seek his protection. He gave him guarantees and also sent a force with him to protect him from the Franks. However a Frankish ambush overwhelmed them on their way and killed a number of the Muslims. The survivors fled.

This year Qarā Arslān, lord of Ḥiṣn Kayfā, took the castle of Shātān. It had belonged to a Kurdish tribe, known as the Juwaniyya. After he had taken it, he demolished it and annexed its surrounding area to the fortress of Tālib.

During this year there died Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥamza ibn ‘Alī ibn Ṭalḥa, the head of the Storeroom. He was a man of important [281] status in the reign of al-Mustarshid bi-Allāh and was a close associate of al-Muqtasī. He built a madrasah for the followers of al-Shāfi‘ī near his own house. Later he went on pilgrimage and on his return he donned wool (*fūṭ*) and the Sufi garb, giving up official business. A certain poet said of him:

O prop of Islam, O thou whose glorious aspirations rose to the heights,
This world was yours but you did not accept it as a realm.²⁰
You chose to abide in the Hereafter.

He kept up a life of devotion in his house for twenty years and continued to be held in respect, visited by all and sundry.

²⁰ Or, following the variant reading, ‘as a residence’ (*dāran*).

Account of al-Mu’ayyad’s conquest of Tūs and elsewhere

On 27 Ṣafar [15 February 1162] al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba besieged Abū Bakr Jāndār in the castle of Waskara Khoy in Tūs, where he had entrenched himself. It was a strong fortress, unassailable. Al-Mu’ayyad attacked, aided against Abū Bakr by the inhabitants of Tūs because his rule was so bad and wicked. When Abū Bakr saw al-Mu’ayyad’s perseverance and unremitting attacks, he yielded and humbly submitted. He descended from the castle on terms on 20 Rabī‘ I [9 March 1162]. After he had done so, al-Mu’ayyad imprisoned him and ordered him to be fettered.

He then moved to Kurstān, whose ruler was Abū Bakr Fākhir. He came down from his castle, which was one of the most impregnable, situated on the top of a high mountain, and gave al-Mu’ayyad his allegiance, submitting to him and coming to an agreement with him. He sent a force from there to Isfarā’īn in Jumādā II [18 May–15 June 1162]. The headman there, ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Hājj fortified himself in its citadel. His father was without doubt ‘the nobleman of Khurasan’. However, this ‘Abd al-Rahmān was but a poor successor. After he had fortified himself within, al-Mu’ayyad’s army surrounded him and persuaded him to come down from the castle. They carried him off in chains to Shādyākh, where he was imprisoned. It has been said that this was in Rabī‘ II of the year 558 [9 March–6 April 1163].¹

Al-Mu’ayyad also conquered the citadel (*Quhandiz*) of Nishapur. What he controlled now encompassed Nishapur, which returned to what it had been previously, except that its population moved out to Shādyākh [283] and the Old City fell into ruin.

He sent an army to Khawāf, where there was a body of troops with a certain emir, named Arghush. The latter stationed an ambush in the local passes and mountains. When al-Mu’ayyad’s troops advanced and brought them to battle, the ambush was sprung and al-Mu’ayyad’s troops were routed and many of them killed. The survivors returned to al-Mu’ayyad at Nishapur.

He also sent an army to Bushanj² [near] Herat, which was under the rule of Prince Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī, and put it under siege. The siege

¹ For the fall of Isfarā’īn, see Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 127. ‘Abd al-Rahmān is there described as ‘a man of base nature’, which translates our text’s variant, *bi’sa al-khulq* (rather than *bi’sa al-khalaf*).

² Krawulsky, 84, s.v. Fušanğ. It is west of Herat on the road to Nishapur; see *EI*(2), i, 342–3.

caused the place much hardship and the fighting and the assaults continued long. Prince Muḥammad sent an army to relieve it and when they drew near to Herat, the besieging army broke camp and withdrew. That region was left in the undisputed control of the Ghurids.

How Ibn Mardanīsh took Granada from ‘Abd al-Mu’min and how he regained it

This year the inhabitants of Granada in Andalusia, which was ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s possession, sent to Emir Ibrāhīm ibn Hamushk, the father-in-law of Ibn Mardanīsh, and invited him to come so that they could surrender the city to him.

He had adopted the beliefs of the Almohads and become a follower of ‘Abd al-Mu’min, an obedient subject and one of those who urged him to attack Ibn Mardanīsh. He then abandoned his allegiance to ‘Abd al-Mu’min and returned to his alliance with Ibn Mardanīsh. After the envoys of the Granada population came to him, he returned with them and entered the city, where were a number of ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s men. They took a secure refuge in the citadel. A report of this reached Abū Sa‘īd Uthmān ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’min in the town of Malaga. He gathered the army he had and set out for Granada to go to the help of their comrades there. Ibrāhīm ibn Hamushk learnt of this and called for aid from Ibn Mardanīsh, the ruler of the east of Andalusia, who sent him 2,000 mounted men from his best troops and the Franks whom he had enlisted. [284] They mustered in the environs of Granada and met the troops of ‘Abd al-Mu’min who were at Granada before Abū Sa‘īd could reach them. The battle between them was fierce and ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s men broke. Then Abū Sa‘īd arrived and also joined the fight. Many of his men were put to flight but a detachment of notables, renowned knights and stout infantry, stood firm with him until they were slain, every last man. Abū Sa‘īd fled at that moment and regained Malaga.

‘Abd al-Mu’min heard of this. He had set out for the town of Salé but he immediately sent them his son Abū Ya’qūb Yūsuf at the head of 20,000 warriors, including several of the Almohad shaykhs. They made all speed. Ibn Mardanīsh received intelligence of this and set out in person with his army to Granada to help Ibn Hamushk. A large number gathered at Granada, where Ibn Mardanīsh camped on the market area³ outside the city. The troops he had initially sent to reinforce Ibn Hamushk, that is, 2,000 cavalry, camped outside the Alhambra castle. Ibn Hamushk camped within the Alhambra with his men. ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s army came to a mountain near Granada, at the foot of which they remained for some

³ In the Maghrib and Andalusia *sharī'a* denoted ‘l'esplanade extérieure de la ville, là où se tient d'ordinaire le marché forain hebdomadaire.’ See the text of the construction inscription for the Bāb al-Sharī'a of the Alhambra, dated 749/1348 (*Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, 156–8).

days. Then they sent a squadron of 4,000 horse who made a night attack on the troops outside the Alhambra and engaged them from all sides. They did not manage to mount up and were killed to the last man.

‘Abd al-Mu’min’s army then advanced in full force and made camp in the environs of Granada. Ibn Mardanīsh and Ibn Hamushk realized that they had not the strength to match them, so they fled on the following night and regained their own lands. The Almohads gained control of Granada during the remainder of the year. Meanwhile, ‘Abd al-Mu’min returned from Salé to Marrakech.

[285] Account of Nūr al-Dīn’s siege of Hārim

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur, lord of Syria, gathered his troops at Aleppo and marched to the fortress of Hārim, which was held by the Franks, to the west of Aleppo. He besieged it and attacked it energetically but it held out against him because of its defensibility and the large number of the Frankish knights, infantry and brave warriors there. When this became known to the Franks, they mustered their horse and foot from all their lands, called their forces together, made their preparations and then set out to force him to raise the siege. When they approached, he desired a pitched battle but they did not comply. They exchanged messages with him and pursued a cautious course of action. When he saw that he was unable to take the fortress and that they would not agree to a battle, he returned to his lands.

One of those who accompanied him on this raid was Mu’ayyad al-Dawla Usāma ibn Murshid ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī, who was the ultimate in bravery. After his return to Aleppo, he went into the mosque at Shayzar, which he had entered the previous year when he was going on the Pilgrimage. When he entered it on this occasion, he wrote on the wall:

To you be praise, my Lord; how much grace and favour
 I owe you which my gratitude cannot comprehend!
 I have come to this mosque this year on my return
 From the campaign, sharing abundantly in its reward.
 I rode my camels from here in the year past
 To the House of God, the [Kaabah’s] corner and the [Black] Stone.
 I fulfilled my religious duty and I set down from my back
 The load of my youthful sins that I carried.

[286] How the caliph gained the castle of Māhkī

In Rajab of this year [16 June–15 July 1162] the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh took the castle of Māhkī. This came about because Sunqur al-Hamadhānī, its lord, gave

it up to one of his mamlukes and went to Hamadhan. This mamluke was too weak to resist the Turkomans and Kurds who surrounded it. He was advised to sell it to the caliph, so he wrote to him about that and an agreement was reached on 5,000 dinars, some arms and other goods and a number of villages. He then surrendered the castle, received what had been agreed and took up residence at Baghdad. This is the castle that continued in the hands of Turkomans and Kurds from the days of al-Muqtadir bi-Allāh until this present time.

Account of conflict between the Muslims and the Georgians

In Sha'bān this year [16 July-13 August 1162] the Georgians gathered in great numbers, amounting to 30,000 warriors, and entered Islamic territory. They aimed for the city of Dvin in Azerbaijan, which they took and sacked. They killed about 10,000 of the inhabitants and the surrounding peasantry. They enslaved the women and took many captives. They stripped the women and led them away naked and bare footed. They burnt the congregational and the district mosques.

When they returned home, the Georgian women condemned what had been done to the Muslim women, saying, ‘You have obliged the Muslims to treat us in the same way as you have treated their women’ and they gave the women clothes.

[287] When news of this reached Shams al-Dīn Īldikiz, lord of Azerbaijan, the Uplands and Isfahan, he called up his troops and was joined by Shāh Arman ibn Sukmān al-Quṭbī, lord of Khilāt and Ibn Āqsunqur, lord of Marāgha and other places. They gathered in a large force of more than 50,000 fighting men and marched into Georgian territory in Ṣafar of the year 558 [9 January-6 February 1163]. They plundered, enslaved women and children and made prisoners of the men. The Georgians confronted them and very fierce fighting followed in which both sides held firm. The hostilities continued between them for more than a month. Victory went to the Muslims and the Georgians were defeated with many of them killed or captured.

The reason for their defeat was that one of the Georgians went to Īldikiz and accepted Islam at his hands. He said to him, ‘Will you give me a force to lead on a route I know and come upon the Georgians from the rear without their knowledge.’ He had trust in him and sent a force with him, having named a day when he himself would move against the Georgians. When that day came, the Muslims engaged the Georgians and while they were fighting, the Georgian convert arrived with his force. They shouted ‘God is great’ and charged the Georgians in the rear, who fled and many were killed or captured. The Muslims took their baggage as booty that was too abundant to be counted. They had been confident that their numbers would give them victory but God frustrated their expectations. The Muslims pursued them, killing and taking captives, for three days and nights and then returned victorious and triumphant.

Miscellaneous events

This year the pilgrims came to Minā but most people did not complete their pilgrimage because they were prevented from entering Mecca and performing the circumambulation and the ‘running’. Those people that entered Mecca on the Day of Sacrifice and performed the circumambulation and the ‘running’, were able to complete their pilgrimage fully but those who delayed beyond that day were prevented from entering Mecca because of a dispute that arose between the Emir of the Pilgrimage [288] and the Emir of Mecca.

The reason was that a group of servitors of Mecca caused trouble for the pilgrims at Minā. One of the Emir of the Pilgrimage’s men called on his comrades for help and they killed some of them. The survivors returned to Mecca, got a group together and raided the pilgrims’ camels, taking nearly a thousand of them. The Emir of the Pilgrimage called his troops together and they rode out fully armed. A battle followed in which several were killed and a number of the pilgrims and the people of Mecca were robbed. The Emir of the Pilgrimage withdrew without entering Mecca and remained at al-Zāhir no more than one day. Many persons returned on foot because of the shortage of camels and met with hardship.

One of those who went on pilgrimage this year was our grandmother, our father’s mother. She missed the circumambulation and the ‘running’. The Shaykh Abū'l-Qāsim ibn al-Bazrī⁴ was asked to give her a legal ruling (*fatwā*), and said, ‘She can continue in the consecrated state she is still in, or if she wishes, she can make some atonement and put off her consecrated state until next year. Returning to Mecca, she may perform the circumambulation and the “running” and so complete her first pilgrimage. Then she may take on the consecrated state a second time, return to ‘Arafāt, do the “standing”, stone the Jumras, carry out the circumambulation and the “running” and so acquire a second pilgrimage.’ She continued in her consecrated state until the following year, went on pilgrimage,⁵ acted as he had said, and thus completed both her first and second pilgrimage.⁵

This year hail of great size fell in Khurasan in the last days of Nīsān [April 1162], mostly in Juwayn and Nishapur and adjacent regions. It destroyed the crops and was followed by heavy rain that lasted for ten days.

⁴ Correct *Kāmil*’s reading al-B.r.rī. Abū'l-Qāsim lived at Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar, where he was presumably consulted for Ibn al-Athīr’s grandmother after her return from the Hijaz. See the relevant *tarjama* under the year 560, p. [321].

⁵ For these pilgrims rites, see *EI*(2), sub verbis *tawāf*, *sa'y*, *jumra*, *ihrām*, *wuqif*. It seems as though the lady had missed just the concluding circumambulation and ‘running’. She had perhaps completed all the main rites on the first occasion because it is impossible to perform them twice in the one year. The abandoning of *ihrām* (consecrated state), e.g. because of illness or unrest, is called *tamattu'* and entails atonement by animal sacrifice or fasting. It could be that by her ‘first pilgrimage’ a separate ‘*umra* (lesser pilgrimage) was intended. For more details, see Ibn Rushd, *Primer*, i, 374–453, especially a section on inability to complete, 419–24.

In Jumādā II [18 May–15 June 1162] a fire broke out in Baghdad which burnt the Birdsellers' Market, the houses near it opposite the new Copper Market, the caravanserai in the Square and the shops of the Seedsmen and others.

This year there died al-Kiyā al-Şabbāhī, lord of Alamūt, the leader of the Ismā‘ilīs. [289] His son took his place and publicly repented. He and his followers restored the prayers and the Ramaḍān fast. They sent to Qazwīn requesting people who could lead them in prayer and teach them the ordinances of Islam and these were duly sent.⁶

In Rajab [16 June–15 July 1162] Sharaf al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Dimashqī began to lecture in the Nizāmiyya Madrasah at Baghdad.

The following died this year:

Shujā’, the Ḥanafī lawyer, in Baghdad. He had been the professor in the madrasah of Abū Hanīfa. His death occurred in Dhū'l-Qa‘da [November 1162].⁷

Şadaqa ibn Wazīr, the preacher.⁸

In Muḥarram [21 December 1161–19 January 1162] the Shaykh ‘Adī ibn Musāfir, the ascetic, who dwelt in the region of the Hakkārīs in the province of Mosul. He was from Syria, from the town of Baalbek. He moved to Mosul and the peasants and the mountain folk of those regions followed and obeyed him. They held him in high repute and his fame was great.

⁶ This paragraph is confused. The leader of the Nizārī Ismā‘ilīs (the Assassins) at Alamūt who died in 557/1162 was Muhammad, the son of the founder Ḥasan al-Şabbāhī. He was followed by his son Ḥasan II, who was known as Kūra Kiyā (Lord of the Region). Far from restoring the Shariah, he suppressed it and proclaimed the spiritual *qiyāma* (resurrection) in 559/1164. He was murdered in 561/1166 by a brother-in-law, who advocated the Shariah, but was quickly succeeded by his son, Muhammad II, who in fact maintained the extreme views of Ḥasan II. Ḥasan III, who succeeded in 607/1210, restored Sunnism and the observance of the Shariah. See Hodgson, *Order of Assassins*, 158–9; Hodgson, ‘Ismā‘ilī State’, 457–70.

⁷ *Muntazam*, x, 204: Thursday 21 Dhū'l-Qa‘da/1 November 1162

⁸ He was a Sufi preacher who, according to Ibn al-Jawzī, won popular support for three things, his extraordinary asceticism, his Ash‘arī tendencies and his Shiism. He died Thursday 8 Dhū'l-Qa‘da/18 October 1162 (*Muntazam*, x, 204–5).

**Account of Shāwar's vizierate for al-Ādīd, followed by the vizierate
of Dirghām**

In Ṣafar of this year [9 January-6 February 1163] Shāwar became vizier for al-Ādīd li-Dīn Allāh al-‘Alawī, the ruler of Egypt. His career and [eventual] vizierate began with his service for al-Ṣāliḥ ibn Ruzzīk and his closeness to him. Al-Ṣāliḥ showed him favour and made him governor of Upper Egypt, one of the greatest offices after the vizierate. When he controlled Upper Egypt, he manifested much competence and increasing ambition. He won the support of the people and the leading men, both Arab and others. It became difficult for al-Ṣāliḥ to deal with him and he was unable to dismiss him. He extended his appointment as governor to prevent him from rebelling. After al-Ṣāliḥ was [attacked and] wounded, part of his memorandum of advice for his son al-Ādīl was: ‘You should not change towards Shāwar, for I am more powerful than you and I have regretted my appointment of him but I have been unable to dismiss him. Do not change his position or the result for you will be something unpleasant.’

After al-Ṣāliḥ had died of his wound and his son al-Ādīl had succeeded to the vizierate, his people persuaded him to dismiss Shāwar and to appoint one of them in his place. They warned him of the dire results of leaving him in office, so he sent to tell him he was dismissed. Shāwar gathered a large following and marched with them to Cairo. Al-Ādīl ibn al-Ṣāliḥ ibn Ruzzīk fled but was captured and killed. His vizierate and that of his father before him had lasted nine years, one month and several days. Shāwar became vizier and took the title *Amīr al-Juyūsh* (Commander of the Armies). He appropriated the money of the Ruzzīk clan, their deposits and their stores. Tayy and al-Kāmil, [291] the sons of Shāwar, also seized a lot from him. A great deal of his property was dispersed but much was secreted away unacknowledged and was revealed to be in their possession when power passed from Shāwar and the Fatimids to the Turks.

Dirghām assembled large forces and came forward as a rival of Shāwar for the vizierate in the month of Ramaḍān [August 1163]. His cause prospered and Shāwar fled from him to Syria, as we shall narrate under the year 559 [1163-64]. Dirghām became vizier.¹

This year there were three viziers, al-Ādīl ibn Ruzzīk, Shāwar and Dirghām. When the latter was firmly in post as vizier, he put to death many of the Egyptian emirs to clear the land of rivals to himself. This was why the state became weak with the result that they lost control of the country.

¹ For the background and career of Dirghām, see *EI*(2), ii, 317-9.

Account of the death of ‘Abd al-Mu’min and the succession of his son Yūsuf

On 20 Jumādā II [26 May 1163] the ruler of the Maghrib, Ifrīqiyya and Andalusia, ‘Abd al-Mu’min ibn ‘Alī died. He had gone from Marrakech to Salé, where he fell ill and died.

When he was close to death, he summoned his leading followers among the Almohads and said to them, ‘I have tested my son Muḥammad and not found him fit for this position. Only my son Yūsuf is fit for it and he is the worthiest, so promote him to it.’ Thus he recommended him to them and they swore allegiance to him, proclaiming him ‘Emir of the Believers’. They concealed ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s death. He was carried from Salé in a litter, to make it seem that he was ill, until he came to Marrakech.

At that time his son Abū Ḥafṣ was a chamberlain for his father and under his brother he continued the same practice that he had had with his father. He would say to people, ‘The Emir of the Believers has commanded such-and-such’, and Yūsuf [292] did not occupy his father’s seat until his own recognition had been completed throughout the lands and his authority firmly established. Then the death of his father ‘Abd al-Mu’min was made public. His reign had lasted thirty-three years and a few months. He was intelligent, forceful, of sound judgement, a good manager of state business, generous with money and yet he shed much blood of Muslims for minor faults.

He revered and strengthened the cause of religion and obliged people on all his lands to attend prayers. Anyone seen not praying at prayer time was put to death. He united people in the Maghrib behind the school of Mālik² for legal matters and behind the school of Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī in theology.³ His salons were dominated by men of learning and religion, to whose authority he deferred, and by discussion with them.

How al-Mu’ayyad took the districts of Qūmis and made the khutbah in Khurasan for Sultan Arslān

In this year al-Mu’ayyad Ay-Aba, lord of Nishapur, went to the land of Qūmis and took control of Bisṭām and Dāmghān. He appointed as his deputy in Qūmis his mamluke Tankiz, who took up residence in Bisṭām. A dispute arose between Tankiz and the Shāh of Mazandaran, which led to open warfare. Each one raised an army and they met and fought early in Dhū'l-Hijja [November 1163]. The troops of Mazandaran were defeated, their baggage plundered and a large number of them killed.

² Mālik ibn Anas (died 179/795 in Medina) founded the eponymous Mālikī school of Shariah law, one of the four orthodox schools.

³ The famous theologian al-Ash'arī (died 324/935 in Baghdad) introduced a moderate dialectic which was nevertheless condemned by fundamentalists, especially the Ḥanbalīs.

After al-Mu'ayyad took the land of Qūmis, Sultan Arslān ibn Tughril ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh sent him a precious robe of honour, banners attached [to standards]⁴ and magnificent gifts and ordered him to [293] take on the comprehensive government of all Khurasan and to make the khutbah in his name. Al-Mu'ayyad donned the robe and put Arslān's name in the khutbah throughout the lands he held.

The circumstances behind this were as follows. Atabeg Shams al-Dīn Īldikiz was the dominant figure in Arslān's state, while Arslān was ruler in name only. Between Īldikiz and al-Mu'ayyad there was a friendship which we have mentioned in connection with the killing of al-Mu'ayyad.⁵ When al-Mu'ayyad gave allegiance to Sultan Arslān, he made the khutbah for him in his lands, namely, Qūmis, Nishapur, Tūs, all the districts of Nishapur and from Nasā to Ṭabas Kīlakī, while naming himself in the khutbah after Arslān. In Jurjan and Dihistan, the khutbah was in the name of Khwārazm Shāh Īl Arslān ibn Atsiz, followed by that of Emir Ay-Tāq. In Marv, Balkh, Herat and Sarakhs, lands in the hands of the Oghuz, except for Herat as it was held by Emir Ay-Takīn, who was an ally of the Oghuz, the khutbah was pronounced in the name of Sultan Sanjar (with the formula 'O God, pardon the fortunate, blessed sultan of the Muslims, Sanjar'), followed by the name of the emir who was ruling in those lands.

Account of the Oghuz's killing of the king of the Ghūr

In Rajab of this year [June 1163] Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī, king of the Ghūr, was killed by the Oghuz. This came about because he assembled his forces and gathered a great host of men and left the mountains of the Ghūr to attack the Oghuz at Balkh. They also mustered and moved against him. It happened that the king of the Ghūr left his camp with several of his close staff, lightly equipped. The Oghuz emirs heard of this and set out with all haste to seek him out before he returned to his camp. When they fell upon him, he gave them the fiercest fight [294] that people had ever seen, but he was killed, as were a small number of those with him. Some others were captured and some fled, rejoined their camp and returned in rout to their lands, father not waiting for son nor brother for brother. They abandoned everything they had just as it was and saved their own lives.

At his death the king of the Ghūr was about twenty years old. He was a just and good ruler. An example of his justice and his fear of the consequences of injustice is that he besieged the people of Herat and after he had taken the city his army

⁴ In Arabic *alwiya ma'qūda*. Cf. Dozy, *Supplément*, ii, 148.

⁵ This is clearly not Ay-Aba but probably refers to the Shiīte scholar of Nishapur, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Mu'ayyad al-Muwaffaqī, killed in 556/1161. See above p. [277-8] although there is no mention of friendship between the two emirs.

wished to sack it. He positioned himself at the entrance to the city and collected money and clothing, from which he gave all his troops something. He said, ‘This is better for you than plundering the property of Muslims and angering God Almighty. Kingdoms will survive despite unbelief but will not survive wicked injustice.’ After he was killed, the Oghuz returned to Balkh and Mary, having seized great amounts of booty from the Ghurid army because its men abandoned all and saved themselves.

Account of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd’s defeat at the hands of the Franks

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī was defeated by the Franks below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād at the battle known as al-Buqay‘a. This came about because Nūr al-Dīn mustered his troops and having entered Frankish territory, camped at al-Buqay‘a below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād to put it under siege and with the intention of attacking and besieging Tripoli. One day while the troops were in their tents at midday, they were surprised by the appearance of Frankish crosses behind the hill on which sits Ḥiṣn al-Akrād. The Franks had met together and agreed on a daytime surprise attack on the Muslims who were feeling safe and secure. The Franks moved immediately with no delay, mustered their troops and set out on a forced march. Before the Muslims were aware of this,⁶ they were close upon them. They tried to stop them but were unable to. They sent to inform Nūr al-Dīn of the situation but the Franks overwhelmed them [295] with their charge and the Muslims did not hold their ground. They withdrew, seeking the Muslim camp with the Franks at their backs. They arrived together at Nūr al-Dīn’s camp. The Muslims were unable to mount their horses and take up their weapons before the Franks were amongst them, killing and capturing many.

The fiercest man against the Muslims was the Byzantine Duke.⁷ He had left his own country to come to the Levant coast with a large body of Greeks, who fought for religious merit, as they would claim. They spared no one. They made for Nūr al-Dīn’s tent but he had already mounted his horse inside and escaped with his life. Because of his haste he mounted his horse while its leg was still hobbled. A Kurd dismounted and severed the rope, so that Nūr al-Dīn escaped but the Kurd was killed. Nūr al-Dīn was generous to his heirs and assigned them fiefs.

Nūr al-Dīn halted at the Lake of Qadas near Homs, four leagues from the battle site. The surviving troops joined him there and one of them said to him, ‘It is not sound sense for you to stay here. Perhaps the Franks’ eagerness will encourage

⁶ The parallel account in *Bāhir*, 117, makes the situation clearer with ‘Before the Muslim scouts were aware’ (*yazak*, ‘scouts, advance guard’, replacing *bi-dhālika*, ‘of this’; in Arabic script the confusion is not impossible). *Yazak* is also the reading of Ms. Pococke 346, fol. 153b.

⁷ In Arabic *al-dūqus*. This was the ‘Imperial general’ Constantine Coloman (see Runciman, ii, 367–70).

them to come against us and we shall be caught in this state.' Nūr al-Dīn reprimanded him and told him to be silent. 'If I had a thousand horse with me,' he said, 'I would face them and not mind them. By God, I shall not shelter under any roof until I revenge myself and Islam.' He then sent to Aleppo and Damascus and summoned money, clothes, tents, weapons and horses. To all the men he gave a replacement of everything taken from them on the basis of their word. The army was restored as though it had not suffered any defeat. The fief of every man that was killed he gave to his children.

As for the Franks, after this defeat [they had inflicted] they intended to attack Homs because it was the nearest territory to them. However, when they heard that Nūr al-Dīn had stationed himself between it and themselves, they said, 'He would not have done this without having the force to resist us.'

[296] When Nūr al-Dīn's men saw the great amount of his expenditure, one of them said to him, 'Within your lands you have many pensions and alms paid to canon-lawyers, pious mendicants, sufis, Koran readers and the like. If you made use of these [funds] at this time, that would be more efficacious.' This made him angry and he replied, 'By God, my only hope for victory is through these men. "It is only by your weak [brethren] that you are sustained and given victory."⁸ How can I cut off the grants of men who fight for me, when I am sleeping on my bed, with arrows that do not miss and distribute them to those who only fight for me when they can see me, with arrows that may hit and may miss! These people have a share in the public purse; how can I rightly give it to others?'

The Franks then communicated with Nūr al-Dīn, asking him for a truce which he did not grant. They left a force to protect Ḥiṣn al-Akrād and returned to their lands.

Account of the expulsion of the Banū Asad from Iraq

This year the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh ordered the destruction of the Banū Asad, the inhabitants of Mazyadid Ḥilla because of their open troublemaking and because the caliph held a grudge against them for the assistance they gave Sultan Muḥammad when he besieged Baghdad. He ordered Yazdan ibn Qumāj to fight them and drive them out of the land. They were widely scattered in the Marshes and it was impossible to tackle them. Yazdan set out, having gathered large forces of horse and foot. He sent to Ibn Ma'rūf, chief of the Muntafiq, who was in the area of Basra. He came with a large host, besieged the Banū Asad and diverted water from them and then played a waiting game. The caliph sent complaints to Yazdan, doubting his competence and accusing him of sympathy with them as Shiites, for Yazdan had Shiite tendencies He and Ibn Ma'rūf then intensified the conflict and

⁸ Nūr al-Dīn here quotes a Prophetic tradition from Tirmidhī, iv, 179 (from the book on Jihad).

their blockade. He closed their routes by water. At that they surrendered. Four thousand of them were killed. [297] A proclamation was made among the survivors: 'If anyone is found after this in Mazyadid Ḥilla, his blood may be legally shed.' They were scattered far and wide and no-one of any note from among them was left in Iraq. Their marshes and lands were given over to Ibn Ma'rūf.

Miscellaneous events

This year a fire broke out in Baghdad, from the entrance to Farāshā Street as far as the Wharf of the Dyers, on both sides.

In Rajab [June 1163] Sadīd al-Dawla Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd al-Karīm, known as Ibn al-Anbārī, the chancery clerk in the caliphal Dīwān, died. He was a learned man of letters, of very high standing with caliphs and sultans. He served in the caliphal Dīwān from the year 530 [1135-36] until this present time and had lived until he was nearly ninety.⁹

During Ramaḍān [August 1163]¹⁰ there died Hibat Allāh ibn al-Fadl ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Muḥammad, Abū'l-Qāsim al-Mattūthī.¹¹ He studied Ḥadīth and was a celebrated poet, although he indulged in much lampooning. An example of his verse is:

O you who have shunned me, caring not,
 Will the time of union return,
 Shall I desire, O torturer of my heart,
 That my mind be at ease in your love?
 My eyes are, as you know well, weeping
 And my body, as you see, is afflicted.
 What harm is it to you to indulge me
 With union at an impossible time?
 I long for you, although you are another's portion.
 O my slayer, what is my remedy?

There is much more of this.

⁹ He went on embassy to Sanjar and other sultans and died on Monday 19 Rajab/=24 June 1163 (*Muntazam*, x, 206).

¹⁰ *Muntazam*, x, 207: Saturday 18 Ramaḍān/20 August (a Tuesday!).

¹¹ i.e from the small town of Mattūth between Qurqūb and Ahwāz (*Ansāb*, xii, 80).

Account of the expedition of Shirkūh and the troops of Nūr al-Dīn to Egypt and their return

In Jumādā I¹ this year [April 1164] Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī sent a large army to Egypt and gave command of it to Emir Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh ibn Shādī, his army chief and the greatest and bravest emir of his state. We shall mention under the year 564 [1168-69] the reason for his connection with Nūr al-Dīn and his high status in his service, God willing.

The reason for sending this army was that Shāwar, the vizier of al-‘Āḍid li-Dīn Allāh the Alid, ruler of Egypt, had been defeated in a contest with Ḑirghām for the vizierate and had fled from him to Syria to take refuge with Nūr al-Dīn and ask for his protection. Nūr al-Dīn received him generously, was kind and liberal towards him. He arrived in Rabī‘ I of this year² and he requested that troops be sent with him to Egypt to restore him to his office. Nūr al-Dīn would receive a third of the revenues of Egypt after the assignments of the troops [had been paid]. Shirkūh would remain with his troops in Egypt and Shāwar himself would act on the orders and at the pleasure of Nūr al-Dīn. The latter continued to take one step forward in this project and then another one backwards. At one moment he was persuaded by consideration for Shāwar’s having sought his court and by the desire to increase his dominion and gain strength against the Franks and at the next he was held back by the dangers of the route, the fact that the Franks were across it and the fear that Shāwar, if he were re-established in power, would perhaps not fulfil his promises.

Eventually he took the firm decision to send troops, ordered them to be equipped and all necessary supplies to be provided. [299] Asad al-Dīn was very eager for this and he had such courage and determination that he was worried by no fear. With preparations made, they all set out with Shāwar in their company in Jumādā I 559 [April 1164]. Nūr al-Dīn instructed Shirkūh to restore Shāwar to his office and to take revenge for him from those who were his rivals for it.

Nūr al-Dīn moved with his troops to the frontier of Frankish territory close to Damascus to prevent the Franks from intercepting Asad al-Dīn and the men with him. The most the Franks could do was to guard their lands from Nūr al-Dīn. Asad

¹ On Thursday 20 Jumādā I/= 16 April 1164 (*Sanā al-barq*, 19).

² This would mean that Shāwar arrived in February 1164. However, ‘this year’ is an error. In *Bāhir*, 120, the year 558 is given but in a retrospective passage, similar in wording to the present text, in the context of events of 559, which may explain the confusion. The correct date is 6 Rabī‘ I 558/12 February 1163 (*Rawdatayn*, i, 406). *Sanā al-barq*, 19, specifies Thursday which would correspond to 14 February.

al-Dīn and his troops reached Bilbays, where Nāṣir al-Dīn,³ Dirghām's brother, came out to meet them with the Egyptian army. He was defeated and returned in rout to Cairo.

Asad al-Dīn came and camped at Cairo in the final days of Jumādā II. Dirghām came out of Cairo the last day of the month [14 February 1164] and was killed at the shrine of Sayyida Nafīsa. His body was left for two days, then was removed and buried in al-Qarāfa. His brother Fāris al-Muslimīn was also killed. Shāwar was given the robe of office on 1 Rajab [15 February 1164] and restored to the vizierate, which he took firm control of. Asad al-Dīn remained outside Cairo and Shāwar acted treacherously towards him. He withdrew from what he had agreed with Nūr al-Dīn and also with Asad al-Dīn over the lands of Egypt. Shāwar sent to the latter ordering him to return to Syria. He replied with a refusal and demanded what had been agreed between them. Shāwar did not comply, so, when Asad al-Dīn saw that, he sent his lieutenants to take over the town of Bilbays and imposed his authority over the eastern provinces. Shāwar sent to the Franks, asking for support and warning them of Nūr al-Dīn, if he should conquer Egypt. The Franks had already convinced themselves that they were lost if he ever achieved control of it. When Shāwar sent asking them to aid him to oust Asad al-Dīn from the country, they were taken with a joy that they had not reckoned on and hastened to respond to his call for help. They had hopes of taking Egypt and Shāwar had already offered them money for the expedition. They therefore made their preparations and set out.

When Nūr al-Dīn heard this news, [300] he moved with his troops to the Franks' frontier to stop them leaving, but this did not deter them because they knew that the danger in staying, if Asad al-Dīn took Egypt, was greater. They left men to guard their territory and the king of Jerusalem set out for Egypt with the rest.

A large body of Franks had come by sea on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The Franks of the Levant sought their aid and they gave it. Some of them joined them in the expedition and others remained in their lands to hold them. When the Franks drew near Cairo (Miṣr), Asad al-Dīn left it and made for the town of Bilbays, where he and his troops remained, making it a fortified base for himself. The Egyptian forces and the Franks combined and besieged Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh in Bilbays and blockaded him there for three months, while he held out despite the fact that the wall was very low and there was no ditch, nor any outworks to protect it. He engaged them morning and night and they achieved nothing and gained no advantage.

In this situation intelligence came to them of the defeat of the Franks at Ḥārim, that Nūr al-Dīn had taken the place and marched against Bānyās, as we shall narrate, if God Almighty wills. Then they became downhearted and wished to

³ Dirghām had three brothers. This was probably Nāṣir al-Dīn Mulham, since Nāṣir al-Dīn Humām took the title Fāris al-Muslimīn, which Dirghām had also used before his vizierate, and that title appears just below. See *EI*(2), ii, 317-19, s.v. Dirghām.

return to their lands to guard them. They made overtures of peace to Asad al-Dīn about returning to Syria and leaving Egypt and his giving up what he held to the Egyptians. He agreed to this because he did not know what Nūr al-Dīn had done to the Franks in Syria and because his provisions and stores were few. He left Bilbays in Dhū'l-Hijja [20 October–17 November 1164].

Someone who saw Asad al-Dīn when he left Bilbays told me the following:

He sent his men out before him. He remained amongst the last, with an iron axe in his hand, to protect their rearguard. Both the Muslims and the Franks were watching him. A Frank from overseas came to him and said, ‘Are you not afraid that these Egyptians and Franks might act treacherously as they have surrounded you and your men and that none of you will survive?’ Shirkūh replied, ‘I wish they would do so, so that you could see what I would do. By God, I would wield my sword and not one of our men would be killed until he had killed several of them. [301] Then al-Malik al-‘Ādil Nūr al-Dīn would attack them, weakened and with their champions eliminated. We would take their lands and any survivors would perish. By God, had these men [of mine] obeyed me, I would have sallied forth against you from the first day, but they refused.’ The Franks made the sign of the cross and said, ‘We used to wonder at the Franks of these lands, their exaggerated description of you and their fear of you. Now we excuse them!’ He then withdrew.

Shirkūh proceeded to Syria and arrived safely. The Franks had stationed a watch in a narrow pass on his route to capture him or win some success against him, but he learnt of that and turned aside from that road.

Concerning this ‘Umāra says:

You seized every pass against the Franks
 And you said to the feet of the horse, ‘Tread on Murrī.’
 If they erect a bridge in the countryside,
 You would cross over the bridge in a sea of iron.

The word ‘Murrī’ at the end of the first line is the name of the Frankish king.⁴

The Frankish defeat and the fall of Hārim

In the month of Ramaḍān [August 1164]⁵ Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī conquered the castle of Hārim from the Franks. This came about because when

⁴ i.e. Amaury or Almaric.

⁵ According to *Bāhir*, 125, on 21 Ramaḍān/12 August (cf. Ibn Wāṣil, i, 145, at nine days left of Ramaḍān).

Nūr al-Dīn returned defeated from al-Buqay‘a below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād, as we have remarked previously, he gave out money and weapons and other equipment, as has been mentioned before, and the army was restored as though no defeat had been suffered. They began to make preparations for the Jihad and for taking revenge.

The Egyptian expedition of some of the Franks with their king took place, as we have narrated. Nūr al-Dīn wanted to [302] attack their land so that they would withdraw from Egypt. He therefore sent to his brother Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd, lord of Mosul and Diyar Bakr, to Fakhr al-Dīn Qarā Arslān, lord of Ḥiṣn Kayfā, to Najm al-Dīn Alpī, lord of Mardin, and other provincial rulers, asking for military aid. Quṭb al-Dīn gathered his army and set out with all haste with Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī, his commander-in-chief, in the van. Fakhr al-Dīn, lord of Ḥiṣn Kayfā, as I have heard, was asked by his boon companions and his close circle, ‘What course do you propose?’ and he said, ‘To stay where I am. Nūr al-Dīn has worn himself out with much fasting and praying, as well as throwing himself and his people with him into dangers.’ All of them agreed with him. The following day, however, he ordered mobilization for the campaign. These men then asked him, ‘What has changed in your ideas? Yesterday we left you in one mind and today we see the opposite.’ He replied, ‘Nūr al-Dīn has taken a certain course with me; if I do not aid him, my subjects will rebel against me and take my lands from me, for he has written to the local ascetics, pious men and those who have renounced this world, telling them what the Muslims have met with from the Franks, the killing and captivity they have suffered, and begging the support of their prayers and asking them to urge the Muslims to take up the struggle. Each one of these men has taken his place in public, with his supporters and followers, and is reading out Nūr al-Dīn’s letters, while weeping and delivering imprecations and curses against me. I have to go to him.’ So he made his preparations and set out in person. Najm al-Dīn also sent troops.

When the forces had gathered, [Nūr al-Dīn] marched to Ḥārim, which he besieged, erecting trebuchets and carrying out a series of assaults. The Franks that remained on the [Levantine] coast assembled and came in their armed might with their princes and knights, their priests and monks. They advanced against him, hastening from every quarter. Their commanders were Prince Bohemond, lord of Antioch, the Count, lord of Tripoli and its districts, the son of Joscelin, one of the Franks’ renowned champions, and the Duke,⁶ a great commander of the Byzantines. They assembled their horse and foot and on their approach [Nūr al-Dīn] moved from Ḥārim to Artāh to encourage them to follow him, so he would have them in his power because they would be far from their territory, if they met him in battle. They followed and made camp at [303] ‘Imm.⁷ They then realized

⁶ Here spelt as *al-dūk*, that is, Constantine Coloman.

⁷ The text reads Gh.mm.r (?). The parallel passage in *Bāhir*, 124, reads ‘Imm, as does Ibn Wāṣil, i, 145, and it is given as the position of the Frankish infantry in *Zubdat al-halab*, ii, 320. ‘Imm is situated in the area of Ḥārim, about midway between Aleppo and Antioch.

that they were too weak to confront him, so they withdrew to Ḥārim. When they withdrew, Nūr al-Dīn followed them with his Muslim heroes prepared for battle.

When both sides drew close, they drew up their battle lines. The Franks began with a charge against the Muslim right wing, where were the Aleppo contingent and the lord of Ḥisn Kayfā. The Muslims there fled and were pursued by the Franks. It is said that this flight on the right was by an agreed plan they had devised, namely that the Franks would follow them and become detached from their infantry, so that the remaining Muslims could turn on the infantry and kill them. When their knights returned, they would find no infantry to take shelter with and no support to rely on. Those who had fled would return on their heels and the Muslims would overwhelm them from the front and from the rear, from the right side and the left. It came about as they had planned. When the Franks pursued those that fled, Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī with the Mosul contingent turned on the Frankish infantry and annihilated them, killing them or taking them prisoner. Their cavalry returned, having checked their pursuit out of fear for their infantry, and the Muslims who had fled came back on their heels. When the Franks arrived, they saw their foot-soldiers either slain or prisoners. Their spirits sank and they saw that they were lost, left in the middle, surrounded on all sides by the Muslims. The battle intensified and became a fierce engagement. Many Franks were killed and their defeat was complete. The Muslims turned from killing to taking prisoners, of whom they took a number beyond counting. Among the captives were the lord of Antioch and the Count, lord of Tripoli, the devil among the Franks and the most unyieldingly hostile to the Muslims, the Duke, the Byzantine commander,⁸ and Joscelin's son. The total of their slain was more than 10,000.

The Muslims advised Nūr al-Dīn to proceed to Antioch and seize it because it was devoid of defenders and fighting men to hold it, but he did not do so. He said, 'The city is an easy matter but the citadel is strong. Perhaps they will surrender it to the Byzantine emperor because its ruler is his nephew. [304] To have Bohemond as a neighbour I find preferable to being a neighbour of the ruler of Constantinople.' He sent out squadrons in those areas and they plundered, seized and killed the inhabitants. Later he ransomed Prince Bohemond for a large sum of money and the release of many Muslim captives.

How Nūr al-Dīn also took the citadel of Bānyās from the Franks

In Dhū'l-Hijja of this year [20 October–17 November 1164]⁹ Nūr al-Dīn conquered Bānyās near Damascus. It had been in the hands of the Franks since the year 543 [1148–9]. When he conquered Ḥārim, he allowed the troops of Mosul and Diyār

⁸ Constantine Coloman was later ransomed for 55,000 dinars and 550 satin robes (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 276).

⁹ According to *Bāhir*, 130, Bānyās was taken in 560/began 18 November 1164.

Bakr to return home and gave out that he was making for Tiberias. The remaining Franks made their chief aim the defence and strengthening of it, but he proceeded with haste to Bānyās because he knew how few were the defending garrison. He besieged it closely and made assaults. Among his troops was his brother, Nuṣrat al-Dīn Amīr Amīrān, who was hit by an arrow and lost one of his eyes. When Nūr al-Dīn saw him, he said to him, 'If the reward which has been prepared for you were revealed to you, you would wish to lose the other.' He pressed the siege hard and, hearing the news, the Franks assembled their forces but did not complete their concentration before the place fell, as the Franks had been weakened by the killing and capture of their men at Ḥārim. Nūr al-Dīn took the citadel and filled it with supplies, equipment and men. He made an arrangement to share the revenues of Tiberias district with the Franks and they undertook to pay him money annually for the districts for which he did not have such an arrangement with them.

The news of the loss of Ḥārim and the siege of Bānyās reached the Franks in Egypt, so they made terms with Shirkūh and returned in order to reach Bānyās in time. However, they arrived only after it had been taken. When Nūr al-Dīn set out to return to Damascus, on his hand he had a ring with a ruby, a most beautiful gem that was called the Mountain [305], because of its size and beauty. It fell from his hand in the scrubland of Bānyās, where there were many trees with thickly entwined branches. When he was some way from the spot where he lost it, he realized what had happened and sent some of his men back to look for it, describing to them the place where he was last aware that he had it. He said, 'I think that is where it fell off.' They went back there and found it. A Syrian poet (I think that it was Ibn Munīr¹⁰) recited in praise of him, congratulating him on this campaign and referring to the ruby 'Mountain':¹¹

If your doubters question whether you are
 The Mahdi, the extinguisher of Antichrist's embers,
 Then [it is certain] because of the return of the Mountain that you lost
 Between the tangled trees and the hills.
 None but Soliman was given it

.....

.....¹² for the throne of your power; it is
 Like his throne, raised high above every limit.
 If the seven seas swallowed it
 And you commanded them, they would straightway disgorge it.

¹⁰ *Rawdatayn*, i, 293, points out that Ahmad ibn Munīr had died in Jumādā II 548/August-September 1153.

¹¹ The Caliph al-Mahdī and various Abbasid successors had a famous ruby called the Mountain (see *Book of Gifts*, 183-5). That any large gem could attract that name is clear from al-Brūnī, *Jamāhir*, 56. For another ruby 'mountain' from the Fatimid treasury, see below p. [369] under the year 567.

¹² The text is obscure and probably corrupt at this point.

When he conquered the citadel, he had with him the son of Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur who had surrendered Bānyās to the Franks. He said to him, ‘By this conquest the Muslims have a cause for joy, while you have two.’ ‘How is that?’ he asked. ‘Because today God has cooled the flames of Hell on your father’s skin.’

Account of the Turks’ taking Ghazna from Malikshāh and his return there

This year the Turks known as the Oghuz attacked the land of Ghazna, which they plundered and destroyed. They attacked Ghazna where was its ruler Malikshāh¹³ ibn Khusroshāh al-Mahmūdī. He realized that he had no power to withstand them, so he abandoned the city and went to Lahore. The Oghuz took the city [306] of Ghazna and the man who took charge of affairs there was an emir named Zankī ibn ‘Alī ibn Khalifa al-Shaybānī.

Later its ruler Malikshāh gathered forces and returned to Ghazna. Zankī abandoned the city and the rule of Malikshāh was restored. He entered the city on Jumādā II of the year 559 [26 April–24 May 1164] and became firmly established in his palace.

Account of the death of Jamāl al-Dīn the vizier and a little about his career

The vizier of Quṭb al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Manṣūr al-Īṣfahānī, died this year in Sha‘bān [23 June–21 July 1164] while under arrest. He had been arrested in the year 558[1162–3] and had remained in prison about a year.

I was told the following by a Sufi called Abū'l-Qāsim who was his particular servant in prison:

During his imprisonment he continued to be concerned about his life to come. He used to say, ‘I feared that I would be borne from my seat of office to the tomb.’ When he became ill, he said to me one day, ‘Abū'l-Qāsim, if a white bird comes to the house, let me know.’ I said to myself that his mind was disturbed. On the following day he asked about it a lot and suddenly a white bird, the like of which I had never seen, alighted. I said, ‘The bird has come’, and he welcomed the news, saying, ‘The truth has come’. He proceeded to make the declaration of faith and to call on the name of God until he passed away. When he died that bird flew away and I realized that he had seen something in the significance of it.

He was buried for about a year alongside Fath al-Karāmī (God’s mercy be upon

¹³ Instead of Malikshāh one should read Khusromalik; see above p. [262], s.a. 555.

him) and then transferred to Medina, where he was buried near the Prophet's sanctuary (God bless him and give him peace) in a hospice [307] he had built for himself there. He said to Abū'l-Qāsim, 'Between me and Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh there is a compact: whichever of us dies first will be taken by the other to Medina and buried there in the tomb he has built. When I am dead, go to him and remind him.' After his death Abū'l-Qāsim went to Shirkūh on this matter. Shirkūh said to him, 'How much do you want?' to which he replied, 'I want the cost of a camel to carry him, a camel to carry me and my provisions.' Shirkūh reproached him, saying, 'Is a man like Jamāl al-Dīn to be transported thus to Mecca!' and he gave him a goodly sum of money to take several people who could perform the pilgrimage on Jamāl al-Dīn's behalf and several who could recite the Koran before his bier when it was carried along or set down from the camel. When he came to a town these reciters would enter proclaiming prayers for him and he would be prayed for in every place they passed through. He also gave money for alms to be given on his behalf. Prayers were said over him in Takrit, Baghdad, Ḥilla, Fayd,¹⁴ Mecca and Medina. In every town crowds beyond numbering gathered to honour him. When they wished to pray for him in Ḥilla, a young man climbed to a high place and recited at the top of his voice:

His bier travelled over people's necks;
Often his liberality and his benefits travelled above the cavalcade.
He passed through a valley and its sands praised him
And by a gathering and the widows there praised him.

We have never seen as much weeping as on that day. They carried him around the Kaabah and prayed over him in the Noble Sanctuary. His tomb is about fifteen cubits from the tomb of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace).

As for his manner of life, he was (God have mercy on him) the most generous of men, the most liberal with his wealth. He was merciful to the people, sympathetic and just. As examples of his good works he restored [308] the mosque of al-Khayf at Minā and spent vast sums of money on it. He built the enclosure beside the Kaabah and he decorated and gilded the Kaabah, which he clad in marble. When he planned that, he sent a magnificent present to al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh and put that request to him. He also sent a large gift and splendid robes of honour to Emir Īsā, the Emir of Mecca, including a turban that cost 300 dinars, and as a result he was allowed to do this. He also built the mosque on Mount Arafat and the steps which lead up to it. People used to find it a great hardship to climb up. At Arafat he also constructed water cisterns and brought water to them from Nu'mān in courses made underground. Much money was expended on them. Water

¹⁴ Also called the fort of Fayd (H̄isn Fayd). It was a pilgrim station 12 days journey from Kufa (Krawulsky, 637-8); 'a short distance south of Ḥayil, present chief town of Jabal Shammār' (Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 83-4).

was made to run in the cisterns every year during the days of Arafat. He built a wall around Medina, city of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), and around Fayd, for which he also built outworks.

At the door of his residence he used to distribute daily to the indigent and the poor one hundred Amīrī dinars,¹⁵ this apart from the pensions and regular bounties for the imams, pious devotees and members of great houses.

Among his remarkable building projects which are without parallel was the bridge which he built over the Tigris at Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar with dressed stone, iron, lead and lime. He passed away before its completion. Nearby he built another bridge in the same fashion over the river known as al-Aryār.¹⁶ He also constructed hospices. From all corners of the earth people sought him out. It is enough that Ibn al-Khujandī, the head of the Shāfi‘īs in Isfahan, sought him out, as did Ibn al-Kāfī, cadi of Hamadhan. He spent [309] a large amount of money on them both. His alms and his benefactions reached from the confines of Khurasan to the limits of Yemen. Every year he used to spend 10,000 dinars on ransoming prisoners, this from Syria alone, not to speak of those he ransomed from the Georgians.

My father told me the following about him:

I frequently used to see Jamāl al-Dīn, when food was offered him, take some and some sweetmeats and leave it in some bread before him. I and others who saw him used to think that he was taking it to the mother of his child ‘Alī. One year he happened to come to Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar with Quṭb al-Dīn. I was in charge of the Diwan there. He brought his concubine, his *umm walad*, to my house to enter the bathhouse. She remained some days at my house. When I was with him at his encampment, after he had eaten, he did what he used to do. The company dispersed and I rose to go, but he said, ‘Sit down,’ so I did. When everyone had gone, he said to me, ‘I am going to favour you over myself today. As I am camping in tents I cannot do what I used to. Take this bread, take it in your sleeve in this napkin. Forget the mace¹⁷ over your head and return home. If on your way you see a poor man who seems to you to be deserving, sit yourself down and feed him with this food.’ I carried this out. I had a large company with me, so on the way I dismissed them, so that they would not see me doing this. I was left with my personal retainers. In one place I saw a blind man with his children and his wife. They were in a wretched state of poverty. I dismounted, produced the food and gave it them to eat. To the man I added,

¹⁵ Amīrī dinars were probably Zankid coins of the twelfth century, so called because they exhibited the caliphal title *amīr al-mu’mīnīn*, which had previously been rarely used on coins (communication from Dr Luke Treadwell).

¹⁶ *Bāhir*, 129 and this passage as quoted in *Rawdatayn*, i, 430, have al-Aryār. *Kāmil* reads al-Aryād (although the ‘y’ lacks any diacritical points).

¹⁷ The text has *ḥamāqa*, which has no appropriate sense. The mace (reading *jumāqa*) was presumably carried over his head as a sign of office.

'Come tomorrow early to so-and-so's house', naming mine, although I did not identify myself. 'I shall have some alms for you from Jamāl al-Dīn.' That evening I rode to the latter's house and when he saw me, he asked, 'What have you done about what I mentioned to you?' I began to tell him about some matter connected with their affairs of state but he said, 'This is not what I am asking you about. I'm asking about the food I gave you.' I told him what had happened. Delighted at this, he said, 'The only thing is you should have told the man to come to you with his family, for you to clothe them, give them [310] some dinars and arrange a monthly payment of a dinar.' I replied, 'I have already told the man to come to me.' He was even more delighted. I treated the man as he had said and he continued to receive his due until he passed away. There were many other times he acted thus. For example, he donated the clothes off his body one year when food was scarce.

Account of the expulsion of the Qarluq Turks from Transoxania

The Chinese Great Khan, the ruler of the Khitay, had entrusted the rule of Samarqand to the Khan Chaghri Khan ibn Ḥasan Takīn and made him governor over it. He was from the ruling house and of ancient lineage. He continued to administer its affairs. At the present time the ruler of the Khitay sent ordering him to expel the Qarluq Turks from the areas of Bukhara and Samarqand as far as Kashgar and that they should abandon the carrying of weapons and engage in agriculture and other occupations. Chaghri Khan gave them these orders but they refused, so he used compulsion and insisted that they move. They gathered together, united and numerous, and went to Bukhara. The lawyer Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Burhān al-Dīn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Māza, the headman of Bukhara, sent to Chaghri Khan to inform him of this and urging him to come with his troops before their evil grew great and they plundered the city.

Ibn Māza sent to them, saying, 'When recently the infidels invaded these lands they refrained from plunder and killing. You are Muslims, warriors for the Faith. It is wicked of you to employ your hands in plundering and shedding blood. I offer you enough money to persuade you to refrain from killing and raiding.' Messengers went to and fro to settle terms, while Ibn Māza was procrastinating, playing for time until Chaghri Khan arrived. Before the Qarluq Turks knew what had happened [311] Chaghri Khan with his troops and his levies overwhelmed them and put them to the sword. They fled in all directions and great was the slaughter and plunder amongst them. A body of them hid in the woods and thickets but were later defeated and eradicated by Chaghri Khan's men, who cleared Bukhara and its regions of their nuisance. Those lands became free of them.¹⁸

¹⁸ Cf. Bosworth, 'The Iranian world', 187-8.

How Sunqur took control of Taliqan and Gharchistan

During this year Emir Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Sunqur, one of the mamlukes of Sanjar, took control of the area of Taliqan and raided the borders of Gharchistan. He carried out a series of raids until he conquered it. Those districts became his and under his jurisdiction. He had some strong castles and well-defended citadels there and made terms with the Oghuz emirs and paid them an annual tribute.

Account of the killing of the ruler of Herat

There was a truce between the ruler of Herat, Emir Aytakīn, and the Oghuz. After the death of Muḥammad the ruler of the Ghūr, Aytakīn became eager for their lands and raided them more than once, plundering and laying waste. When it was the month of Ramaḍān this year [23 July–21 August 1164], Aytakīn gathered his forces and marched to the land of the Ghūr. They came to Bamiyan and the province of Bust and Rukhkhaj. He was resisted by their ruler Ṭughril Takīn [312] Yurunqush al-Falakī on behalf of the Ghurids, who appeared in Bamiyan. Ṭughril Takīn took control of Bust and Rukhkhaj, both of which he handed over to a scion of the Ghurid ruling house. As for Aytakīn, he penetrated deeply into the lands of the Ghūr and was met by its inhabitants who fought and blocked his progress, resisting him manfully. His troops were defeated and he himself was killed in the battle.

How the Shah of Mazandaran took Qūmis and Bisṭām

We have mentioned how al-Mu’ayyad, ruler of Nishapur, took Qūmis and Bisṭām and those regions and that he appointed as his deputy there his mamluke Tankiz. During this present year the Shah of Mazandaran sent out an army whose command he gave to an emir of his, called Sābiq al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī. He went to Dāmghān and took it. Tankiz gathered the troops he had and marched against him to Dāmghān. Al-Qazwīnī moved out to confront him and arrived taking Tankiz by surprise. Before he and his troops knew what was happening al-Qazwīnī attacked and put them to the sword. They scattered and fled in rout. The troops of the Shah of Mazandaran seized those regions. Tankiz returned to al-Mu’ayyad, lord of Nishapur, and busied himself with raiding Bisṭām and the area of Qūmis.

Account of the rebellion of the Ghumāra in the Maghrib

After people had confirmed the death of ‘Abd al-Mu‘min in the year 559, the tribes of Ghumāra rebelled along with Miftāḥ ibn ‘Amr, who was a great leader among

them. They followed him [313] every one of them and held out in their mountains, which are like strong fortresses, they themselves being various peoples. Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min prepared to march against them, accompanied by his two brothers, 'Amr and 'Uthmān, leading a large army of Almohads and Arabs. They advanced against them and fought a battle in the year 561 [1166-7], in which the Ghumāra were defeated and many of them slain. Among those killed were Miftāh ibn 'Amr, their commander, and several of their notables and chiefs. Their lands were taken by force.

There were many tribes there who were contemplating dissent. They waited to see what would be the outcome for the Ghumāra and when the latter met their deaths, those tribes submitted and followed the path of obedience. No agitator for uprising and rebellion was left and the population throughout the Maghrib remained quiet.

Miscellaneous events

This year Emir Muḥammad ibn Unur raided Ismā'īlī territory in Khurasan, taking the inhabitants unaware. He killed many of them, plundered and took prisoners and captives. His men filled their hands with booty.

This year Abū'l-Fadl Naṣr ibn Khalaf, the ruler of Sijistan, died at the age of more than 100. His reign lasted for 80 years. He was succeeded by his son, Shams al-Dīn Abū'l-Fatḥ Aḥmad ibn Naṣr.¹⁹ Abū'l-Fadl was a just ruler who did not despoil his subjects. He performed some fine exploits to aid Sultan Sanjar in more than one situation.

The emperor of Byzantium left Constantinople with innumerable forces and attacked the lands of Islam which were held by Qılıç Arslān and Ibn Dānishmand. The Turkomans gathered in [314] those lands in a great host. They used to raid the fringes of the emperor's army at night but by morning there was nobody to be seen. Many of the Greeks were killed until their losses reached tens of thousands. The emperor returned to Constantinople and after his return the Muslims took several fortresses from him.

This year the Imam 'Umar al-Khwārizmī, the preacher and mufti of Balkh, died there.

The Cadi Abū Bakr al-Mahmūdī also died this year, the author of prose works and poetry who wrote *maqāmas* in Persian on the model of the Arabic *maqāmas* of al-Ḥarīrī.

¹⁹ Two of the so-called Maliks (princes) of Nimruz, who had no dynastic connection with the earlier Saffarids. Tāj al-Dīn II Naṣr ibn Bahā' al-Dīn Khalaf, Sanjar's brother-in-law, ruled, in fact, for nearly 60 years, 499-559/1106-64. His son, Shams al-Dīn, was overthrown and killed in Sha'bān 564/May 1169; see Bosworth, *Saffarids of Sistan*, 389-97 and 398-9.

Account of the death of the Shah of Mazandaran and the succession of his son

On 8 Rabī‘ I this year [23 January 1165] the Shah of Mazandaran, Rustum ibn ‘Alī ibn Shahriyār ibn Qārin, died. After his death his son ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Ḥasan concealed his demise for some days until he had taken control of all the castles and the land and then he divulged it. When the news of his death became public, Ay-Tāq, the lord of Jurjan and Dihistan, declared his opposition to the son’s accession. He did not take into consideration what he owed to his father, for the latter had always defended him and protected him when he sought refuge with him. However, ‘kingship is barren’.¹ From his opposition he gained nothing but a bad reputation and obloquy.

How al-Mu’ayyad’s army besieged Nasā and then withdrew

Al-Mu’ayyad had sent an army to the city of Nasā. They besieged it until Jumādā I of this year [began 16 March 1165]. The Khwārazm Shāh Ḥasan ibn Atsiz then sent an army to Nasā and when they drew near, al-Mu’ayyad’s troops withdrew and returned to Nishapur at the end of Jumādā I [ended 14 April 1165].

Al-Mu’ayyad’s troops moved to meet the army of Khwārazm because it had set out towards Nishapur. [316] Al-Mu’ayyad’s troops advanced to repel them and when the Khwārazmian force heard this it retired. The lord of Nasā became subject to the Khwārazm Shāh and made the khutbah in his name there.

The army of Khwārazm then marched to Dihistan, so its ruler, Emir Ay-Tāq, sought refuge with al-Mu’ayyad, lord of Nishapur, after there had been a strong antipathy between them. Al-Mu’ayyad now welcomed him and supplied him with a powerful force which remained with him so that al-Mu’ayyad averted the danger to himself and his territory from the direction of Tabaristan. However, Dihistan was conquered by the Khwārazmian troops and they established a prefect of their own there.

Account of al-Mu’ayyad’s taking control of Herat

We have mentioned the killing of the ruler of Herat in the year 559 [1164]. When he was killed, the Oghuz emirs made their preparations and proceeded to Herat

¹ This proverbial saying means that kingship and rulership are states in which neither kinship nor friendship guarantee anything. See Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v. ‘aqīm.

which they put under siege. A man called Athīr al-Dīn had taken charge there. He was inclined towards the Oghuz and while ostensibly fighting them was secretly in touch with them. Because of this a large number of the inhabitants of Herat perished so the people united and put him to death. His place was taken by Abū'l-Futūḥ 'Alī ibn Faḍl Allāh al-Tughrā'ī. The citizens sent to al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba, lord of Nishapur, offering allegiance and obedience. He sent them his mamluke Sayf al-Dīn Tankiz with an army and he dispatched another force which raided Sarakhs and Marv. They seized the mounts of the Oghuz and returned safely. Hearing this, the Oghuz departed Herat for Marv.

[317] The conflict between Qilij Arslān and Ibn Dānishmand

This year there was discord between Prince Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, lord of Konya and neighbouring lands in Anatolia, and Yaghī Arslān ibn Dānishmand, lord of Malatya and those parts of Anatolia adjacent to it. A fierce battle took place between them.

This came about because Qilij Arslān married the daughter of Prince Ṣātuq ibn 'Alī ibn Abī'l-Qāsim. The bride was sent to Qilij Arslān with a great dowry, the value of which was incalculable. Yaghī Arslān, lord of Malatya, carried out a raid and seized the bride and what she was bringing and wished to marry her to his nephew, Dhū'l-Nūn ibn Muḥammad ibn Dānishmand. He commanded her to renounce Islam, which she did, so that her marriage with Qilij Arslān would be annulled, and then, when she reverted to Islam, he married her to his nephew. Qilij Arslān gathered his army and marched against Ibn Dānishmand. When they met in battle, Qilij Arslān was defeated and sought refuge with the emperor of Byzantium, who came to his help by sending him a large army. During those days Yaghī Arslān ibn Dānishmand died and Qilij Arslān took some of his land. He and Prince Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Dānishmand made peace, because the latter had succeeded his uncle Yaghī Arslān, while Dhū'l-Nūn ibn Muḥammad ibn Dānishmand had taken control of Kaysari and Shahānshāh ibn Mas'ūd, the brother of Qilij Arslān, took Ankara. Terms to which they all agreed were drawn up between them.

[318] Account of discord between Nūr al-Dīn and Qilij Arslān

This year there was a deep estrangement between Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Syria, and Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, lord of Anatolia, which led to warfare and mutual grudges. When news of this reached Egypt, the vizier of the Egyptian caliph, al-Ṣāliḥ ibn Ruzzīk, wrote to Qilij Arslān, forbidding this and ordering him to come to an agreement with Nūr al-Dīn. He added some verse to his letter:

We speak but where is anyone who understands
 And recognizes the right course, when that is obscure?
 Not everyone who weighs affairs and controls them
 Is successful in the matter that he determines on.
 Nobody remains everlasting in power
 And nobody can escape what God has decreed.
 After the enemy have tasted the taste of your warfare
 With their lips (and it was bitter colycinth),
 Have you returned to the rule of rivalry between you
 While a fire flames up from your mutual rancour?
 Is there not among you one who fears God alone?
 Are there not among your flock any men that are Muslim?
 Come then, perhaps God will bring victory to His religion,
 If we and you aid the Faith.
 We will rise against the Infidel with a resolve,
 Through the likes of which lands are gained and divided.

There is more to the poem than this. This is how a certain scholar reported the matter and also that al-Şāliḥ sent the poem. If the poem is really al-Şāliḥ's, then the incident ought to precede this present date, for al-Şāliḥ died in Ramadān of the year 556 [24 August–22 September 1161]. If the poem is not his, then the incident does belong to this present time. It is possible that this rivalry may date from the days of al-Şāliḥ, who wrote these verses, and that it then continued until this present time.

[319] Miscellaneous events

In Ṣafar of this year [18 December 1164–15 January 1165] serious discord occurred in Isfahan between Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ibn al-Khujandī and the cadi, along with other members of the schools of law on account of partisan support for the various schools. Fighting between the two groups lasted for eight days in succession, during which large numbers were killed. Many houses and markets were burnt and destroyed. They then disengaged in the worst possible state.

This year the Ismā‘īlīs built a castle near Qazwin. Shams al-Dīn Īldikiz was spoken to about it, but he was unable to condemn this situation for fear of their wickedness and their murderous attacks. They moved against Qazwin later and besieged it. The inhabitants fought them as fierce a fight as people had ever seen. One of our friends, no, one of our shaykhs and learned imams, told me the following:

I was in Qazwin, engaged in religious study. There was a man there who was

the leader of a large band, well known for his bravery. He had a red turban which he wrapped around his head when he fought. I loved him and was eager to sit [and study] with him. One day when I was with him, he said, 'I have had a vision of the schismatic [Ismā'īlīs] attacking the city tomorrow. We sallied forth and fought them. I was at the head of the people, wrapped in this turban. We fought them and I was the only man killed. Then the schismatics retired as our people did too.' By God, the next day the cry went up that the schismatics had come. The people went out to battle. I remembered what the man had said. I went forth too but my only desire was to see whether what he said had proved true or not. After only a little time the people returned with that man borne before them dead and wearing his red turban. They told that none of them had been killed but he. I was left amazed at how his words had proved true with not a single thing changed. From where did he gain this sure knowledge?

[320] When he told me this story, I did not ask him about the date. It was certainly in this period in this area and so I have recorded it under this year by plausible guesswork.

This year al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba, lord of Nishapur, arrested his vizier Ɗiyā' al-Mulk Muḥammad ibn Abī Ṭālib Sa'd ibn Abī'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd al-Rāzī and put him in prison. He appointed as vizier to follow him Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Abī Naṣr Muḥammad the Comptroller. In the days of Sultan Sanjar he had exercised supervision over his administration and been one of the notables of Sanjar's state.

This year news arrived that people had set out on Pilgrimage in the year 559 [1164] and had met with hardship. A great crowd was separated from them at Fayd, Tha'labiyya, Wāqiṣa and elsewhere and many perished. The pilgrim caravan did not go to Medina, the city of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) for these reasons and because of the high prices and lack of foodstuffs. Illness broke out in the desert and uncounted masses died. Their animals perished too and prices at Mecca were high.

In Ṣafar [18 December 1164-15 January 1165] al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh arrested Emir Tūba ibn al-'Uqaylī, who had drawn very close to him, so much so that he used to have private audiences with him. Al-Mustanjid loved him very much and the Vizier Ibn Hubayra was jealous of him. He planted letters from the 'Ajamīs with some people and ordered them to expose themselves to arrest. Having done this, they were seized and brought before the caliph. They produced the letters after strong resistance and when the caliph read them he set out for King's Canal to go hunting. Tūba's encampment was on the Euphrates. He came before the caliph who ordered his arrest. He was seized, taken into Baghdad by night and put into prison. That was the last that was heard of him. The vizier did not long enjoy life after him, but died three months later. Tūba was one of the most perfect Arabs for manly virtue, intelligence, generosity and

learning. United in him were qualities of perfection that are distributed among other people.²

[321] This year the following died:

Shihāb al-Dīn Māhmūd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Hāmidī al-Harawī, the vizier of Sultan Arslān and vizier of Atabeg Shams al-Dīn İldikiz, in Rabī‘ I [16 January–14 February 1165].

‘Awn al-Dīn Ibn Hubayra, the vizier. His name was Abū'l-Muzaffar Yaḥyā ibn Muḥammad, the caliph’s vizier. He died in Jumādā I [March 1165],³ having been born in the year 490 [1097].⁴ He was buried in the madrasah that he had built for the Ḥanbalīs at the Basra Gate. He himself was a Ḥanbalī, a pious, good and learned man. He used to study the ḥadīth of the Prophet and wrote excellent works on that subject. He was a man of sound judgment and was held in high repute by al-Muqtafī, so much so that al-Muqtafī used to say, ‘The Abbasids have had no vizier comparable to him’. When he died his sons and his family were arrested.⁵

Muhammad ibn Sa‘d al-Baghdādī at Mosul. He was the author of some good poetry, for example:

I shall give my life for one whose love entrusted me
 With a long time of illness and sickness.
 I do not know after all this
 Whether my lord is angry or pleased.

The Shaykh and Imam Abū'l-Qāsim ‘Umar ibn ‘Ikrima ibn al-Bazrī⁶ al-Shāfi‘ī. He studied with the lawyer al-Kiyā al-Harrāsī. He was the leading man of his age in canon law. [Requests for] fatwas used to come to him from Iraq, Khurasan and all other lands. He himself was from Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar.

² The letters implicated Tūba in alleged subversion of the troops at Hamadhan. Ibn al-Jawzī is very indirect: ‘a certain great man advised his arrest and execution. This person did not live long afterwards’ (*Muntażam*, x, 210).

³ On Sunday 13 Jumādā I/28 March 1165 according to *Muntażam*, x, 216, and *Rawḍatayn*, i, 440–41.

⁴ Ibn al-Jawzī tells that he washed his body, having had a dream which presaged his sudden death, and that poison was suspected. The year of Ibn Hubayra’s birth he gives as 499/1105–6 (*Muntażam*, x, 214), as does Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 256. However, *Rawḍatayn*, i, 441, gives his birth date as Rabī‘ II 497/15 February–15 March 1165.

⁵ One son, ‘Izz al-Dīn Muhammad, escaped from prison in Rabī‘ II 561/4 February–4 March 1166, hid in a mosque, was betrayed, returned to a dungeon, then taken out and strangled (*Muntażam*, x, 218).

⁶ This *nisba* is corrected on the basis of Subkī, *Tabaqāt*, iv, 288–90, who, in his notice for Abū'l-Qāsim, says ‘from *bazar*, the name for the oil extracted from flax seeds and used by the people of those regions [Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar] to light lamps’. Abū'l-Qāsim was born in 471/1078–9 and died on 13 Rabī‘ I/28 January 1165.

The conquest of Munayṭira from the Franks

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī conquered the fortress of Munayṭira¹ in Syria, which was in the hands of the Franks. He made no great mobilization, nor assembled his full forces. He just marched lightly equipped and took them unaware. He knew that, if he assembled his troops, they would be on their guard and concentrate their troops. He seized the opportunity, marched to Munayṭira and put it under siege, attacking energetically. He took it by storm and killed or made captive those within and took large amounts of booty. The defenders had felt safe but God's cavalry overwhelmed them suddenly before they were aware. The Franks gathered to repel him only after he had already taken it. Had they known that he was lightly equipped with a small number of troops, they would have hastened against him, but they imagined that he led a large host. After he had taken it, they dispersed and despaired of recovering it.

Account of the killing of Khuṭlubars, the fief-holder of Wāṣiṭ

This year Khuṭlubars, the fief-holder of Wāṣiṭ, was killed. He was killed by the nephew of Shumla, lord of Khuzistan. This came about because Ibn Sankā,² who was Shumla's nephew, had become allied by marriage to Mankūbars, the fief-holder of Basra. It happened that al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh killed Mankūbars in the year [323] 559 [1163-4] and after his death Ibn Sankā attacked Basra and plundered its villages. From Baghdad a message was sent to Kumushtakīn, lord of Basra, ordering him to oppose Ibn Sankā. He said, 'I am a financial official, not a military commander,' meaning that he was a tax farmer, incapable of raising an army. Ibn Sankā became more ambitious and went up to Wāṣiṭ, whose hinterland he plundered. The fief-holder there, Khuṭlubars, gathered a force and came out to fight him.

Ibn Sankā contacted the emirs with Khuṭlubars and won them over. When a battle followed, Khuṭlubars' army fled and he himself was slain. Ibn Sankā seized Khuṭlubars' banner and set it up. His men saw it and thought that he was still alive, so began to return to him. All who came back Ibn Sankā seized and either put to death or made prisoner.

¹ A castle commanding an important pass over the Lebanon range, which connects Baalbek with Tripoli. See Yāqūt, iv, 673; Elisséeff, 245-6.

² Is this Qilij, also called Shumla's nephew, see below p. [329].

Miscellaneous events

This year the Georgians appeared with a large host and raided various lands. They even reached Ganja, where they killed, captured and enslaved many and took untold amounts of booty.

The following died this year:

Al-Ḥasan ibn al-‘Abbās ibn Rustum, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Īṣfahānī al-Rustumī, the pious shaykh. He was celebrated and a transmitter from Aḥmad ibn Khalaf and others.³

The Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Abī Ṣalih, Abū Muḥammad al-Jīlī, a resident of Baghdad. He was born in the year 470 [1077–8]. His piety was of an exalted order and he was a Ḥanbalī. His madrasah and his hospice are famous in Baghdad.⁴

³ He died in Ṣafar/December 1165 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 210).

⁴ His teacher Abū Sa‘d al-Mukhramī built a small madrasah at the Azaj Gate in Baghdad, which he entrusted to ‘Abd al-Qādir. It was enlarged because of the large number of those who came to hear ‘Abd al-Qādir preach. He died the eve of Saturday 8 Rabī‘ II/= 12 February 1166, aged 90, and was buried in his madrasah (*Muntaẓam*, x, 219).

Account of the return of Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh to Egypt

Under the year 559 [1163–4] we have already told of Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh's expedition to Egypt, what happened to him and his return to Syria. After his arrival in Syria he remained as formerly in the service of Nūr al-Dīn up to the present time.

After his return from Egypt he continued to talk about the project of invading it. He was extremely eager to do this. When this year came, he equipped troops and set out at the head of a powerful force in Rabī' II [25 January–22 February 1167].¹ Nūr al-Dīn sent several emirs with him and the full complement [of his force] reached 2,000 cavalry. Nūr al-Dīn disliked the plan but, when he saw how serious Asad al-Dīn was about going, it was impossible for him to do other than send a force with him, for fear that a disaster might befall them and Islam be weakened. When his army had gathered he set out for Egypt by land, leaving Frankish territory on his right. Having arrived in Egypt, he made for Aṭfīḥ and near there crossed the Nile to the west bank. He then camped at Giza opposite Old Cairo and exercised full control and jurisdiction over the western provinces, remaining for 50 and more days.

After Shāwar had heard of Asad al-Dīn's coming, he sent to ask for assistance from the Franks. They came, by all means at their disposal,² ambitious to conquer Egypt and fearing that, if Asad al-Dīn took it, there would be no future left for them in their lands with him and Nūr al-Dīn. Hope was leading them and fear driving them. When they arrived at Cairo, they crossed to the west bank. Asad al-Dīn [325] and his troops had already gone to Upper Egypt. He came to a place called Bābayn. The Egyptian troops and the Franks followed behind him and came up with him there on 25 Jumādā II [18 April 1167]³. Asad al-Dīn had sent spies to the Egyptians and Franks, who returned with information about their numbers and equipment and their determination to pursue him. He decided to give battle, although he feared that the morale of his men might be too weak for them to stand firm in this dangerous situation where their destruction was more likely than their survival, because of their small numbers and their distance from their homes and homelands and the dangers of the route. He consulted them and all advised him to cross the Nile to the east bank and return to Syria. They said to him, 'If we are defeated, and that is the most likely outcome, where can we take refuge and who

¹ According to *Rawdatayn*, ii, 10, he 'returned to Egypt' on 9 Rabī' II/2 February 1167.

² Literally 'on recalcitrant and docile mount(s)'. Cf. Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v. §.^c.

³ *Bāhir*, 132, has 25 Jumādā I/19 March 1167, as does *Rawdatayn*, ii, 11.

will protect us, seeing that in these lands every soldier, citizen and peasant is our enemy?’

One of Nūr al-Dīn’s mamlukes, called Sharaf al-Dīn Buzghush, the lord of Shaqīf, who was a valiant man, rose and said, ‘Whoever fears being killed or captured, let him not serve princes; rather let him stay at home with his wife. By God, if we return to Nūr al-Dīn without a victory or without any pardonable heroic effort, he will surely take away any fief or salary we have and make us pay back whatever we have received since we entered his service until this present day. He will say, “You receive Muslims’ money and run away from their enemies and deliver a place such as Egypt to the infidels!”. The truth is on his side.’

Asad al-Dīn said, ‘This is the right idea and I shall act on it.’ His nephew, Saladin, said the same and there were many who expressed their agreement. The unanimous decision was to fight. Asad al-Dīn remained in his position until the Egyptians and the Franks came up with him, already drawn up for battle. He placed his baggage train in the centre, to take great care of it and because he was unable to leave it anywhere else, where the local people might plunder it. He stationed Saladin in the centre and said to him and the men with him, ‘The Egyptians and the Franks will begin their charge against the centre, imagining that I am there. When they charge you, do not fight your utmost and do not imperil yourselves. Give way before them but if they retire, come back on their heels.’

[326] He himself selected from his bravest men a group he could rely on and whose steadfastness in battle he knew. He stood with them on the right wing. When the two sides clashed, the Franks did as he had said and charged the centre. The troops there fought them a while and then retreated – but not in disorder. The Franks followed them and at that moment Asad al-Dīn and the troops with him charged the [Egyptian] Muslim and Frankish cavalry and infantry who had not joined the charge. He scattered them and put them to the sword, with great slaughter and the taking of many prisoners. When the [other] Franks returned from their pursuit, they saw their forces defeated and the field devoid of them. They too fled. This is one of the most remarkable events recorded, that 2,000 cavalry should rout the armies of Egypt and the Franks of the Levant coast.

How Asad al-Dīn took Alexandria and then returned to Syria

After the Egyptians and the Franks had been defeated by Asad al-Dīn at Bābayn, he proceeded to Alexandria and collected whatever money was in the settlements on his route. Having arrived at Alexandria, he took it over with the assistance of the inhabitants who surrendered it to him. He appointed Saladin, his nephew, as his deputy there and returned to Upper Egypt which he seized and taxed, remaining there until the fast of Ramaḍān [began 21 June 1167].

The Egyptians and the Franks returned and regrouped at Cairo. They remedied the condition of their forces, united and marched to Alexandria, where they

besieged Saladin very closely. Food became short for those within but the people endured that. Asad al-Dīn came to them from Upper Egypt after Shāwar had suborned some of the Turkomans serving with him. Envoys of the Franks and the Egyptians came seeking peace. They offered him 50,000 dinars, apart from what he had seized from the country. He accepted and stipulated that the Franks should not remain in the country nor gain a single village there. They agreed to this and when peace had been made he returned to Syria. The Egyptians took over Alexandria in mid-Shawwāl [4 August 1167] and Shirkūh arrived [327] at Damascus on 18 Dhū'l-Qa'da [5 September 1167].

The Franks and the Egyptians arranged among themselves that the Franks should have a prefect in Cairo and that the city gates should be under the control of their knights to prevent Nūr al-Dīn's sending an army against them, and that from the annual revenue of Egypt they should have 100,000 dinars. This was all agreed with Shāwar. Al-'Ādīd had no authority alongside him, for his freedom was restricted and all knowledge of affairs was kept from him.

The Franks returned to their territory in the Levant but they left a detachment of their renowned knights in Egypt. Al-Kāmil Shujā', son of Shāwar, sent a message to Nūr al-Dīn with one of the latter's emirs,⁴ telling him of his love and friendship and asking to be admitted to his allegiance. He guaranteed that he himself would follow this course and that he would make a united Egypt obedient to him. He offered tribute to be paid every year. Nūr al-Dīn agreed to this and sent a large sum of money to him.⁵ The situation remained like this until the Franks attacked Egypt in the year 564 [1168-9], when there took place what we shall relate, God willing.

Account of Nūr al-Dīn's taking Ṣāfīthā and 'Urayma

This year Nūr al-Dīn called his forces together. His brother Quṭb al-Dīn came to him from Mosul and others came too. They assembled at Homs and then Nūr al-Dīn took his troops into Frankish territory. They passed by Ḥiṣn al-Akrād and carried out plundering raids. They made for 'Arqa and put it under siege. They also besieged Ḥalba,⁶ which they took and destroyed. The Muslim troops marched left and right through their lands, raiding and destroying. They took 'Urayma and Ṣāfīthā⁷ and then returned to Homs, where they observed their Ramaḍān fast.

⁴ This was Saladin's maternal uncle, Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Ḥārimī (*Bāhir*, 134).

⁵ This is the plain sense of the text in the *Kāmil*, as though 'seed money' was spent to support Shujā' initially. However, *Bāhir*, 134, reads 'They brought a large sum of money to Nūr al-Dīn.'

⁶ Ḥalba was the Crusader Castrum Album, situated between 'Arqa and 'Akkār, inland from Tripoli.

⁷ The Crusader Chastel Blanc (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 138-41).

[328] Later they proceeded to Bānyās and marched to attack the fortress of Hūnīn,⁸ which was held by the Franks, one of their most impregnable fortresses and castles. The Franks fled and set fire to it. The day after that Nūr al-Dīn arrived and razed its wall completely. He wished to invade Beirut but a dispute broke out among the troops which necessitated their dispersal. Quṭb al-Dīn returned to Mosul and Nūr al-Dīn gave him the city of Raqqā on the Euphrates, which had been his. Quṭb al-Dīn took it over on his way back to Mosul.

Account of Ibn Sankā's attack on Basra

This year Ibn Sankā again attacked Basra and plundered and destroyed the area on the eastern side. He then went to Maṭārā.⁹ Kumushtakīn, lord of Basra, moved to meet him in battle. They fought and both sides held firm but then Kumushtakīn fled to Wāsiṭ, where he joined with Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Ja'far ibn al-Baladī, the overseer there. With them both was their fief-holder Arghush. They received intelligence that Ibn Sankā was on his way to Wāsiṭ. People were extremely fearful of him but he did not come.

Account of Shumla's attack on Iraq

This year Shumla, the ruler of Khuzistan, came to the castle of Māhkī in the lands around Baghdad and sent to the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh, requesting part of the land and being quite immoderate in his demands. The caliph sent most of his troops to resist him and also dispatched Yūsuf al-Dimashqī to reprimand him and warn him of the consequences of his actions. Shumla claimed as his excuse that İldikiz and Sultan Arslān Shāh had assigned Basra, Wāsiṭ and al-Hilla to the prince whom he held [under his control], a son of Malikshāh, and he presented the rescript [329] which ordered that. He added, 'I will be satisfied with a third of that.' Al-Dimashqī brought back this message and the caliph ordered that Shumla be [publicly] cursed as a rebel. Troops were gathered and sent to Argush al-Mustarshidī, who was at al-Nu'māniyya along with Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Ja'far ibn al-Baladī, overseer of Wāsiṭ, facing Shumla.

Shumla then sent Qilij, his nephew, with a detachment of his army to fight a group of Kurds. Arghush with part of the army he had with him rode against Qilij and brought him to battle. He captured Qilij and some of his followers and sent them to Baghdad. Shumla heard of this and sued for peace but he was not given a positive answer. However, after the battle Arghush fell from his horse and died.

⁸ Known to the Crusaders as Chateau Neuf. It overlooked Hule Lake and is now a little to the west of modern Qiryat Shemona (Krawulsky, 604).

⁹ Krawulsky 461, s.v. Maṭara.

Shumla remained in his position facing the caliphal army but when he realized that he was not strong enough to defeat them, he withdrew to his own lands. His campaign had lasted four months.

Miscellaneous events

This year Ghāzī ibn Ḥassān al-Manbijī rebelled against Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Syria. Nūr al-Dīn had given him the fief of Manbij, which is where he revolted. Nūr al-Dīn sent an army which besieged him and took the town, and then he gave it as a fief to his brother, Quṭb al-Dīn Yinal ibn Ḥassān, who was just,¹⁰ good and kind to his subjects, a man of excellent conduct. He continued to hold it until Saladin took it from him in the year 572 [1176-7].

Fakhr al-Dīn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā'ūd ibn Suqmān ibn Artuq, lord of Ḥiṣn Kayfā and most of Diyār Bakr, died this year. When his illness grew serious, he sent to Nūr al-Dīn, saying, ‘We are comrades in the Jihad against the infidels. I wish you to look after my son because of this.’ After his death his son Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad succeeded him and the Syrian Nūr al-Dīn undertook [330] to aid and protect him, since his brother Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd wished to invade his lands but Nūr al-Dīn, his brother, sent to stop him, saying, ‘If you attack him or interfere in his lands, I shall prevent you by force’, so he refrained from attacking him.

Abū'l-Ma'ālī Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan¹¹ ibn Ḥamdūn, the Baghdad secretary in charge of the Diwan of Control, was arrested and died in prison.¹²

Qumāj al-Mustarshidī, father of Emir Yazdan, one of the greatest emirs in Baghdad, died this year.

¹⁰ *Bāhir*, 135, has ‘wise’.

¹¹ Correct the text’s ‘ibn al-Ḥusayn.’

¹² Born 485/1102, he was the author of a history/anthology called *al-Tadhkira* (see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 330). He died in Dhū'l-Qa'da/19 August-17 September 1167 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 221).

Account of Zayn al-Dīn’s departure from Mosul and how Quṭb al-Dīn assumed authority in his lands

This year Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Baktakīn, the lieutenant of Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, lord of Mosul, left the service of his master at Mosul and went to Irbil. He was the dominant power in the state and most of the land was in his hands, including Irbil, where were his home, his children and his treasure chests, Shahrazūr and all the fortresses that went with it, all the land of the Hakkarīs and its castles, including al-‘Imādiyya, the lands of the Ḥumaydīs, Takrit, Sinjār, Ḥarrān and the citadel of Mosul, where he himself was. He was afflicted by deafness and also became blind. When he decided to leave Mosul for his home in Irbil, he surrendered all the lands that he held to Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd and retained Irbil alone.

He was brave, wise and just, an excellent ruler, pure of heart and favoured by fortune, for he was never defeated in battle. He was also generous and bestowed much on his troops and others. Ḥayṣa Bayṣa praised him with an ode and when he wished to recite it, Zayn al-Dīn said, ‘I do not know what he is going to say but I realize that he wants something.’ He ordered him 500 dinars, a horse, a robe of honour and other apparel, the whole worth 1,000 dinars. He remained in Irbil until his death there this year.

After Zayn al-Dīn had departed from the citadel of Mosul, Quṭb al-Dīn entrusted it to Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd [331] al-Masīḥ and gave him authority in his lands. Fakhr al-Dīn repaired the citadel which was in a ruined state because Zayn al-Dīn had paid little attention to building works. ‘Abd al-Masīḥ, who was a white eunuch, one of Atabeg ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī’s mamlukes, imposed a harsh regime and firm government.

The battle between Pahlawān and the ruler of Marāgha

This year Āqsunqur al-Aḥmadīlī, ruler of Marāgha, sent to Baghdad asking for the khutbah to be made in the name of the prince who was in his protection, the son of Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, offering that he would not invade the land of Iraq and making no other requests. He proposed to supply money if his request was granted. He was answered with some comforting words.

News of this came to Īldikiz, lord of those regions, and it vexed him. He equipped a large force, as commander of which he appointed his son, Pahlawān, and sent them against Āqsunqur. A battle between them followed which ended

in the defeat of Āqsunqur and his fortifying himself in Marāgha. Pahlawān descended on the town and closely besieged him there. Later envoys were exchanged between them and peace was made. Pahlawān returned to his father at Hamadhān.

Miscellaneous events

In this year the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh appointed as his vizier Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Ja'far Ahmād ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd, known as Ibn al-Baladī. He was inspector at Wāsiṭ and displayed great competence in his office. The caliph summoned him and made him vizier. 'Aḍud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj, son of Ra'iṣ al-Ru'asā, had gained a dominant position. However, the caliph gave orders to Ibn al-Baladī to limit the scope of his activities and that of his family and his followers. This he did. He put a guard on Tāj al-Dīn, the brother of the major-domo, and demanded that he produce accounts for King's Canal, because he had been administering it since the reign of al-Muqtāfi. He did the same [333] with others and thereby gained considerable sums of money. The major-domo feared for his own position, so produced much money.

In this year the following died:

'Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr, Abū Sa'd ibn Abī Bakr ibn Abī'l-Muzaffar al-Sam'ānī al-Marwazī, the Shāfi'i lawyer. He was an assiduous student of Ḥadīth and voyaged in search of it. He heard more Ḥadīth than anyone else. He travelled to Transoxania and Khurasan several times. He visited the Uplands, Isfahan, Iraq, Mosul, the Jazira, Syria and other lands. He is the author of celebrated works, such as *The Supplement to the History of Baghdad*, *The History of the City of Marv* and *The Book of Affiliation*¹ among others, in which he excelled. He recorded his teachers, who numbered more than 4,000 shaykhs. Abū'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī mentioned him disparagingly. One of the things he said about him was that he would take a shaykh in Baghdad² across the river to a place above 'Īsā Canal and claim, 'So-and-so told me in "the land beyond the river".' This is very ridiculous, for the man really did travel 'beyond the river' [to Transoxania] and heard Ḥadīth from most of its shaykhs in most of the region. What is the point of this silly misrepresentation? His fault in the eyes of Ibn al-Jawzī was simply that he was a Shāfi'i, and [in that] he was a model for others, for Ibn al-Jawzī spared none but tried and tested Ḥanbalīs.³

¹ Here called *Kitāb al-Nasab*. This work is well known as *Kitāb al-Ansāb*, a voluminous study of *nisbas*, i.e. adjectives expressing affiliation, mostly to place.

² The text here reads 'al-shaykh [used generically] bi-Baghdād'. The parallel passage in *Muntaẓam* (see following note) has 'al-Shaykh al-Baghdādī'.

³ The text has: *mukassarī al-Hanābila*. I assume that this derives from the description of quality wood as *sulb al-maksar* (hard at the break), see Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v. *maksar*. The

Chief Cadi Abū'l-Barakāt Ja'far ibn 'Abd al-Wāhid al-Thaqafī in Jumādā II [13 March-10 April 1168].⁴

Yūsuf al-Dimashqī, the Niẓāmiyya professor, in Khuzistan, after he had travelled as an envoy to Shumla.⁵

Shaykh Abū'l-Najīb al-Shahrazūrī, a Sufi and a lawyer. He was a renowned pious man and was buried at Baghdad.⁶

expression is glossed in Zamakhsharī, ii, 307, with ‘when its excellence is known by breaking it’. Hence *mukassar* could mean ‘broken, tested to breaking and found strong’.

Ibn al-Jawzī had a low opinion of al-Sam'ānī (*Muntazam*, x, 224–5). He accused him of unacceptable personal attacks on Ḥanbalī scholars and errors in his own writings.

⁴ Born in Muḥarram 519/7 February–8 March 1125), he died when being pressured for money by Ibn al-Baladī, the vizier (*Muntazam*, x, 224).

⁵ A zealous follower of Ash'arī, he died in Shawwāl/9 July–6 August 1168 (*Muntazam*, x, 226).

⁶ Called 'Abd al-Qāhir ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Suhrawardī (*sic*) in *Muntazam*, x, 225. He was born c.490/1097, studied and taught in the Niẓāmiyya, built a madrasah and a hospice and died in Jumādā II/13 March–10 April 1168.

How Nūr al-Dīn took Qal‘at Ja‘bar

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī gained control of Qal‘at Ja‘bar, taking it from its ruler Shihāb al-Dīn Mālik ibn ‘Alī ibn Mālik al-‘Uqaylī. It had been in his hands and the hands of his ancestors before him since the days of Sultan Malikshāh, as has already been mentioned. It was one of the strongest and most fortified castles, overlooking the Euphrates on the eastern bank.

It fell because its ruler left it to go hunting and was seized by the Banū Kilāb who took him to Nūr al-Dīn in Rajab of year 563 [11 April-10 May 1168]. He was imprisoned but treated well and was encouraged by the offer of a fief and money to hand over the castle. He refused, however, and there was a change to harsh and cruel treatment and threats. Still he refused, so Nūr al-Dīn sent an army commanded by Emir Fakhr al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn Abī ‘Alī al-Za‘farānī. The castle was besieged for a while but no success was gained. Nūr al-Dīn reinforced them with another army and placed in command of the whole force Emir Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr, known as Ibn al-Dāya, who was his milk-brother and his senior emir. He also continued the siege but saw no hope of gaining the place, so he followed a soft line with the ruler and advised him to take what Nūr al-Dīn was offering in exchange and not risk his life by holding on to it. The ruler accepted what he said and surrendered the castle, taking in exchange [335] for it Sarūj, its dependencies, al-Mallāḥa, lying between Aleppan territory and the gate of Buzā‘a, and 20,000 dinars as a down payment. This is a very great fief, except that it possesses no castle.

This marks the end of the power of the Banū Mālik in Qal‘at Ja‘bar. Every regime reaches a limit and every rule has an end. I have heard that its ruler was asked ‘Which do you prefer and which affords a better rank, Sarūj and Syria or Qal‘at Ja‘bar?’ He replied, ‘The former are richer but as for honour, that we have left behind in Qal‘at Ja‘bar.’

Account of Asad al-Dīn’s conquest of Egypt and the killing of Shāwar

In Rabī‘ I this year [December 1168] Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh ibn Shādī went to Egypt with the troops of Nūr al-Dīn and conquered it. This came about because, as we have mentioned, the Franks took power in Egypt and appointed their own prefect in Cairo, took over the city gates, stationed a body of their warriors and leading knights there and established a tyrannical rule over the Muslims, doing great harm to them. When they saw this and that there was nobody in the land to resist them,

they sent to the king of the Franks in Syria, namely Amaury, whose like for bravery and subtle cunning the Franks had not had since they appeared in Syria, summoning him to secure its conquest. They informed him that it was devoid of any defender and they portrayed its taking as an easy matter. However, he did not respond favourably. The Frankish knights and policy makers came together before him and advised him to invade and conquer it. He said to them, 'My opinion is that we should not invade, for it feeds us, its wealth is driven our way and we gain strength from it against Nūr al-Dīn. If we attack with the aim of conquest, [336] then its ruler, his troops, all the country and its peasants, will not surrender it to us but will fight us for it and fear of us will bring them to surrender it to Nūr al-Dīn. If he takes it and he has someone like Asad al-Dīn there, that means death to the Franks and their expulsion from the land of Syria.' However, they did not accept his words and replied, 'There is nobody there to resist and defend it. Before Nūr al-Dīn's army can be equipped and march to Egypt, we shall have taken it and finished the matter. Then Nūr al-Dīn will be hoping for security from us.' He therefore went with them against his will.

They began making their preparations and putting it out that they intended to attack the city of Homs. When Nūr al-Dīn heard of this, he also began to gather his troops and ordered them to come to him. The Franks made all haste to march to Egypt. When they arrived, they besieged Bilbays, took it by assault on 1 Šafar [4 November 1168], and sacked it, having killed, captured and enslaved.

A group of Egyptian notables had written to the Franks and promised them help on account of their enmity to Shāwar. They included Ibn al-Khayyāt and Ibn Farjala. The spirits of the Franks were heartened and they left Bilbays to go to Cairo. They descended upon Cairo on 10 Šafar [13 November 1168] and put it under siege. The inhabitants feared that they would treat them as they had treated the people of Bilbays. Fear of them aroused them to resist; they held the city, fighting strongly, and did their best to protect it. Had the Franks behaved well towards the people at Bilbays, they would have conquered old and new Cairo, but God Almighty convinced them that what they did was for the best, 'in order that God should complete his plan destined to be done'.¹

Shāwar ordered Old Cairo to be set on fire on 9 Šafar [12 November] and ordered its people to be moved to Cairo and the town to be plundered. The people moved out but were left on the roads. The place was plundered and its inhabitants impoverished. Their money and their goods were lost a day before the Franks descended on them. All this was because of the fear that the Franks would seize it all. The fire continued to burn for fifty-four days.²

The Caliph al-Ādīd sent to Nūr al-Dīn asking for his help and telling him that the Muslims were too weak [337] to repel the Franks. With the letters he sent the locks of his womenfolk, saying, 'These are the locks of my women from my palace

¹ Koran, viii, 42 and 44.

² For a reassessment of this event, see Kubiak, 'The burning of Miṣr al-Fustāṭ'.

beseeching your help to rescue them from the Franks.' Nūr al-Dīn therefore embarked on the dispatch of troops.

The Franks meanwhile intensified the siege of Cairo and blockaded its inhabitants. Shāwar was the one who took charge of affairs, the troops and the fighting. His situation became difficult and he was too weak to drive them away. He turned to subterfuge. He sent to the king of the Franks telling him of his goodwill and old love for him and that his heart was with him because of his fear of Nūr al-Dīn and al-Āqīd, but the Muslims would not agree with him about submitting to the king. He was advising peace and the taking of some tribute to prevent Nūr al-Dīn from taking the country. The king agreed to this on condition that they give him 1,000,000 Egyptian dinars, some as a down payment and some in later instalments. An agreement was reached on that basis.

The Franks saw that the country stood against them and would perhaps be surrendered to Nūr al-Dīn, so they agreed unwillingly. They said, 'We will take the money and use it to build our strength. We shall come back to the country again with a force that allows us to disregard Nūr al-Dīn. 'They schemed and God schemed and God is the best of schemers.'³ Shāwar paid them 100,000 dinars and asked them to withdraw so that he could collect the [remaining] money for them. They withdrew but only nearby. Shāwar started to collect the money for them from the inhabitants of new and old Cairo. He only managed to collect a sum which was less than 5,000 dinars, the reason for this being that the people of old Cairo had had their houses and the contents burnt and whatever survived had been plundered. They were unable to gather food, let alone instalments of tribute. In new Cairo the majority of the inhabitants were soldiers and their servants, so for this reason money was not readily available to them. However, in the meanwhile they were sending to tell Nūr al-Dīn of the situation they were in and they offered him the third of [the revenues of] Egypt, that Asad al-Dīn should dwell among them with an army and that their financial support [338] should also come from Egypt, quite apart from the third that would be theirs.

When he received al-Āqīd's letters in Aleppo, Nūr al-Dīn sent to Asad al-Dīn to summon him. The messengers set out to seek him and met him near the gates of Aleppo, just arrived from Homs which was his fief. The reason for his arrival was that he had also received letters from the Egyptians on the same matter and had set out to go to Nūr al-Dīn. They met and Nūr al-Dīn was amazed at his immediate appearance. Delighted at this and considering it as a good omen, he ordered him to prepare to go to Egypt and gave him 200,000 dinars, apart from apparel, mounts, weapons and other things, and full authority over the army and the treasure chests. Asad al-Dīn selected 2,000 cavalry from the standing army and with the money he took enlisted 6,000 cavalry. He, with Nūr al-Dīn, set out for Damascus, where he arrived at the end of Ṣafar [2 December 1168]. He then proceeded to Ra's al-Mā'. Nūr al-Dīn gave every man with Asad al-Dīn twenty

³ Koran, iii, 54.

dinars as a bonus, not counted as part of his pay. He attached to Asad al-Dīn a further group of emirs, including his mamluke ‘Izz al-Dīn Jūrdīk, ‘Izz al-Dīn Qilij, Sharaf al-Dīn Buzghush, ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Yārūqī, Quṭb al-Dīn Yīnāl ibn Ḥassān al-Manbijī and Saladin (Yūsuf son of Ayyūb, Shīrkūh’s brother), the last named unwillingly. ‘It may be that you dislike something, though it is best for you, and it may be that you want something, although it is the worst thing for you.’⁴ Nūr al-Dīn wanted Saladin to go and that meant the end of his house, while Saladin did not want to go but that led to his good fortune and rule. This will be mentioned with the death of Shīrkūh, if God Almighty wills.

Asad al-Dīn set out with all haste from Ra’s al-Mā‘ in the middle of Rabī‘ I [17 December 1168]. When he drew near Old Cairo, the Franks departed, returning to their own lands, disappointed of their hopes. Nūr al-Dīn heard of their return and rejoiced and ordered the victory drums to be beaten throughout his land. [339] He dispatched messengers far and wide to spread the good news of that, for it was a reconquest of Egypt and a preservation of all Syrian and other lands.

Asad al-Dīn reached Cairo on 7 Rabī‘ II⁵ [8 January 1169], made his entry and met with al-Āḍid li-Dīn Allāh, who bestowed a robe of honour on him. He returned to his tents wearing al-Āḍid’s robe to the delight of the people of Old Cairo. He and his army were provided with large allowances and abundant supplies. Shāwar was unable to prevent this because he saw that Shīrkūh’s forces were numerous and that al-Āḍid’s sympathies were with him, and yet he did not dare reveal what was in his heart but began to delay the implementation of the offer of money to Nūr al-Dīn, the assigning of income to the army and the setting aside of the third of the land for Nūr al-Dīn. Every day he would go to Asad al-Dīn, ride with him, making promises and raising his hopes. ‘Satan makes only deceitful promises.’⁶

Later he determined to give a banquet to which he would invite Asad al-Dīn and his emirs, and then arrest them, enlist their troops and use them to defend the land from the Franks. His son al-Kāmil forbade this and said to him, ‘By God, if you plan to do this, I shall inform Shīrkūh.’ His father said to him, ‘By God, if we do not do this, we shall all be killed for sure.’ ‘Yes,’ he replied, ‘but that we should be killed as Muslims when the land is held by Islam is better than that we should be killed after the Franks have taken it, for it would only take their hearing that Shīrkūh had been arrested for you to see the Franks’ return. Then, even if al-Āḍid were to go on foot to Nūr al-Dīn, he would not send a single horseman with him and the Franks would conquer the country.’ He abandoned the action he had intended.

When the Nūrid army saw Shāwar’s prevarication, they feared he would cause

⁴ Koran, ii, 213.

⁵ Kāmil’s ‘Jumādā II’ is clearly an error. Cf. *Bāhir*, 139; *Rawdatayn*, ii, 55.

⁶ Koran, iv, 120.

trouble. Saladin, [340] ‘Izz al-Dīn Jūrdīk and others agreed to kill Shāwar. When they told Asad al-Dīn, he forbade them to do it but they held their peace, still determined to kill him. It happened that Shāwar visited Asad al-Dīn’s troops as was his practice but did not find him in his tents. He had gone to pay a visit to the tomb of al-Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him). Saladin and Jūrdīk with a detachment of the army met Shāwar, saluted him and informed him that Shirkūh was visiting the tomb of the Imam al-Shāfi‘ī. He said, ‘Let us go to him’, so they set out together. Saladin and Jūrdīk rode alongside him and then threw him from his horse to the ground. His followers fled away and he was made a prisoner. They were unable to kill him without the order of Asad al-Dīn, so they made sure he was well guarded and then informed Asad al-Dīn of the situation. He came to them and was unable to do anything but complete what they had started. The Caliph al-‘Āqid, lord of Egypt, heard the news and sent to Asad al-Dīn, requesting him to send him Shāwar’s head. After an exchange of messages, he was put to death and his head sent to al-‘Āqid on 17 Rabī‘ II⁷ [18 January 1169].

Asad al-Dīn entered Cairo and saw such a multitude gathered there that he feared for his life, so he said, ‘The Commander of the Faithful’ (meaning al-‘Āqid) ‘orders you to sack Shāwar’s residence.’ The people scattered in that direction and sacked it. Asad al-Dīn himself made for al-‘Āqid’s palace and was invested with the robe of the vizierate and entitled al-Malik al-Manṣūr Commander of the Armies. He proceeded in his robes of office to the vizieral residence, which was where Shāwar had been, and could find nothing there to sit on. He became firmly established in office and in full control. There was no one left to stand against him or rival him. He appointed to the provinces those of his followers whom he could trust and assigned the country as fiefs to his troops.

As for al-Kāmil ibn Shāwar, when his father was killed, he and his brothers entered the palace to take refuge there. That was the last that was heard of them. Shirkūh regretted al-Kāmil’s loss, because he heard [341] how he had dealt with his father to prevent him from killing Shirkūh. He used to say, ‘I wish he had survived so that I could give him a handsome recompense for his good deed.’

Account of the death of Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh

When Asad al-Dīn’s foot was firmly established and he reckoned that he had no rival left, his fate caught up with him. ‘Until, when they rejoiced in what they had been given, we seized them suddenly.⁸ He died on Saturday 22 Jumādā II 564 [=22 March 1169]. His time in office had been two months and five days.

Concerning the beginning of his career and the manner of his connection with Nūr al-Dīn, he and his brother, Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, both sons of Shādī, were from

⁷ *Sanā al-barq*, 41, adds that it was a Saturday.

⁸ Koran, vi, 44.

the town of Dvin and were Rawādī Kurds in origin, which lineage is the noblest of the Kurds. They both came to Iraq and served Mujāhid al-Dīn Bahrūz, the prefect of Baghdad. In Najm al-Dīn, who was older than Shirkūh, he saw intelligence, much good sense and excellent conduct. He made him castellan of the citadel of Takrit, which he held, and Najm al-Dīn duly went there accompanied by his brother Shirkūh. When the Martyr Atabeg Zankī ibn Āqsunqur met with defeat in Iraq at the hands of Qarāja al-Sāqī, as we have narrated under the year 526 [1131–2],⁹ he came in his rout to Takrit, where Najm al-Dīn served him well and provided him with boats on which he crossed the Tigris. His men followed him and they too were well received by Ayyūb and sent on their way.

Later Shirkūh killed a man at Takrit because of insults that had been exchanged between them. Bahrūz expelled both [brothers] from the citadel and they made their way to the Martyr Zankī, who received them kindly and duly recognized their previous service to him by giving them both handsome fiefs. After he had taken the citadel of Baalbek he appointed Ayyūb as castellan [342] there. When the Martyr was killed, the army of Damascus besieged Baalbek, while Ayyūb was within, and his situation became difficult. Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī was too busy settling his lands to help him, so Ayyūb was compelled to surrender Baalbek to the Damascenes. He gave it up in return for a fief which he specified. This was granted and he became one of the greatest emirs at Damascus.

His brother Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh joined Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd after Zankī was killed, as he had served him during the reign of his father. Nūr al-Dīn favoured and advanced him and saw in him bravery that others were incapable of. He heaped rewards upon him, until he came to hold Homs, Rahba and other places and was made commander of his standing army. When Nūr al-Dīn wished to take Damascus, he ordered him to make contact with his brother Ayyūb, who was there, and to ask him to cooperate in its conquest. He agreed to what was desired of him in return for a fief, which he named for himself and his brother and for some villages which they would acquire. Nūr al-Dīn gave them what they asked for and conquered Damascus, as we have told. He kept his word to them and they became the greatest emirs of his state. When he planned to send troops to Egypt, he saw that Shirkūh alone was fit for this mighty matter and this important position. He therefore sent him and he achieved what we have described.

How Saladin became ruler of Egypt

When Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh died, Saladin, the son of his brother Ayyūb ibn Shādī,

⁹ I.e. Qarāja the Cupbearer. Ibn al-Athīr appears to be mistaken here. Under the year 526/1132 he records Qarāja's defeat and execution by Sanjar near Dīnawar. Later the same year Zankī, as an ally of Sanjar, invaded Iraq and was defeated by the Caliph al-Mustarshid and Naṣar the Eunuch; see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), 294–5.

was with him, having travelled with him despite his unwillingness to go on the expedition. A friend of ours, who was one of those close to and intimate with him, recounted to me what Saladin told him:¹⁰

When al-‘Ādīd’s letters came to Nūr al-Dīn, asking for his aid against the Franks and requesting the dispatch of troops, he summoned me and told me of the situation. He said, ‘You will go to your uncle Asad al-Dīn at Homs [343] with my messenger to bid him come. Urge him yourself to make haste. This matter brooks no delay.’ I complied and left Aleppo. We were not a mile from Aleppo before we met Shirkūh coming about this very matter. Nūr al-Dīn ordered him to set out and when Nūr al-Dīn said that to him, my uncle turned to me and said, ‘Get ready, Yūsuf!’ I replied, ‘By God, were I to be given the dominion of Egypt, I would not go there. I have endured in Alexandria and elsewhere what I shall never forget.’ He said to Nūr al-Dīn, ‘It is essential that he come with me. Do you order him to do so?’ Nūr al-Dīn gave the order to me, although I was asking to be excused, and our audience ended. Asad al-Dīn had made his preparation and it only remained to set out, when Nūr al-Dīn said to me, ‘You have to go with your uncle.’ I complained of financial straits and lack of kit, but he gave me the wherewithal to equip myself. It was as though I was being driven to my death, but I went with him and he conquered Egypt. Then he died and God Almighty gave me great dominion, for even a part of which I had never aspired.

As for how he gained office, several Nūrid emirs who were in Egypt sought command of the troops and appointment as al-‘Ādīd’s vizier after Shirkūh, including ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Yārūqī, Quṭb al-Dīn [Khusro ibn Tulayl], Sayf al-Dīn [‘Alī ibn Aḥmad]¹¹ al-Mashtūb al-Hakkārī and Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Ḥārimī, Saladin’s maternal uncle. Each one of these was soliciting the office and had gathered followers to take it by force. However, al-‘Ādīd sent for Saladin, summoned him into his presence and gave him the robes of office and made him vizier to follow his uncle.

What persuaded him to do this was that his men said to him, ‘In that company there is none weaker nor younger than Yūsuf. The best plan is for him to be appointed, for he will not escape from under our control. Then we shall infiltrate his troops with people to win them over to our side. We will gain sufficient troops to defend our country, and then arrest or expel Yūsuf.’

[344] After his appointment with the title al-Malik al-Nāṣir, not one of these emirs who wanted the post for themselves obeyed him or made obeisance to him. The lawyer ‘Isā al-Hakkarī was with him and won al-Mashṭūb over to his side after

¹⁰ The ‘friend’ was possibly Bahā’ al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, who reported Saladin’s unwillingness to take part in the expeditions (see Bahā’ al-Dīn, 41 and 43). *Bāhir*, 141, has simply: ‘I was told that he said ...’.

¹¹ The names given in brackets here are from *Bāhir*, 141-2.

strenuous efforts. He said to him, ‘This post will never come to you with the likes of ‘Ayn al-Dawla, al-Hārimī and others.’ Then he went to al-Hārimī and said, ‘Here we have Saladin, who is your nephew, and his power and dominion are for your advantage. His position is secure. Do not be the first to strive to oust him from it; it will not come to you.’ He too then gave him his backing. Subsequently ‘Isā did the same with the rest and all of them offered him obedience, other than ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Yārūqī, for he said, ‘I shall never serve Yūsuf,’ and he returned to Nūr al-Dīn in Syria along with some other emirs. Saladin’s foot became firmly established and yet for all that he was a deputy of Nūr al-Dīn.

Nūr al-Dīn in his correspondence with him addressed him as *amīr isfahsalār* and he would sign with his motto signature at the head of his letter, too proud to write his personal name.¹² He also did not send him an individual letter but used to write ‘the Emir Isfahsalār Saladin and all the emirs in Egypt will do such-and-such.’

Saladin tried to win over the hearts of people and bestowed sums of money. They therefore turned to him and gave him their affection, while al-Ādīd’s position weakened. Later Saladin sent a request to Nūr al-Dīn to send him his brothers and his family. This Nūr al-Dīn did, having stipulated that they give him their allegiance, further his cause and give him all help.¹³ All of them did this. Saladin took the fiefs of the Egyptian emirs and gave them to his family and the emirs who were with him. He increased their good fortune and they increased in love and allegiance to him.

I have perused histories and seen many events of Islamic history that can be reliably documented. I have seen in the case of many who start a dynasty that power is transferred from their immediate offspring to other family and relatives. For example in the early years of Islam Mu‘āwiya ibn Abī Sufyān was the first of his family to rule. Power passed from his descendants to the Banū Marwān, his cousins. Later, with al-Saffāh, the first of the Abbasids to rule, power was transferred from his line to his brother al-Manṣūr. Consider the Samanids; the first family member to gain independent power was Naṣr ibn Aḥmad, but power shifted from him to his brother [345] Ismā‘il ibn Aḥmad and his descendants. Then take Ya‘qūb al-Ṣaffār, the first of his house to rule; power was transferred to his brother ‘Amr and his descendants. Then Imād al-Dawla ibn Buwayh, the first of his family

¹² *Isfahsalār*, originally Persian, means ‘army commander.’ The significance is that Nūr al-Dīn recognized Saladin’s status only in relation to himself, not as having independent authority as Fatimid vizier. The motto signature (*‘alāma*) was used with subordinates. Nūr al-Dīn’s on a decree was ‘Praise be to God’ (*al-ḥamad li-Allāh*), see *Rawdatayn*, ii, 270. A letter in his own hand to Ibn Abī ‘Asrūn was headed *ḥasbī Allāh wa-kafā* (God is my sufficiency and my all), see *Rawdatayn*, ii, 119.

¹³ The ‘him’ here refers to Saladin. *Bāhir*, 143, makes it clear that Nūr al-Dīn was concerned that Saladin’s brothers, particularly Shams al-Dawla Ṭūrānshāh, the eldest, might not respect Saladin’s position. Possibly this may have been an excuse initially but further enemy threats to Egypt led to their being sent on the understanding mentioned.

to rule; power passed from him to his brothers, Rukn al-Dawla and 'Izz al-Dawla and then came to the descendants of Rukn al-Dawla and Mu'izz al-Dawla and ended with those of Rukn al-Dawla only. Consider the Saljuq dynasty: power passed from its first member to rule, Ṭughril Beg, to the descendants of his brother Dā'ūd. Finally take this Shīrkūh: as we have mentioned, power was transferred to the descendants of his brother Ayyūb, and from Saladin too, after he had established and exalted the dynasty and become its founder, power passed to the offspring of his brother al-'Ādil and in the hands of his own offspring there remained only Aleppo.

These are the greatest of the Islamic dynasties. Were it not for fear of prolixity, we would mention more examples. What I think to be the reason for this is that the person who is the first of a dynasty takes extreme measure¹⁴ and seizes power, while the hearts of his predecessors are deeply attached to it. Therefore God, as a punishment for him, denies it to his descendants and those for whose sake he acts.

Account of the battle of the blacks at Old Cairo

Early in Dhū'l-Qa'da this year [began 27 July 1169] Mu'tamin al-Khilāfa was killed.¹⁵ He was a eunuch in al-'Ādīd's palace, who had authority there and command of all the people it contained. He and a group of Egyptians agreed to write to the Franks, and invite them into the country and use their powerful support against Saladin and his followers. They sent letters with a man they could trust and remained [346] in expectation of a reply. This messenger went to al-Bi'r al-Bayḍā',¹⁶ where he was met by a Turkoman, who saw that he was wearing two new sandals. He took them from him and said to himself, 'If these were part of this man's normal wear they would be worn out, for he has a ragged appearance.' He was suspicious of the man and the sandals, so took them to Saladin, who tore them apart and saw the letter within. He read it but kept quiet about it.

Mu'tamin al-Khilāfa's plan was that the Franks should make a move on Egypt and that when they arrived, Saladin would march to fight them with his troops and then Mu'tamin al-Khilāfa would rise up with his Egyptians against those left behind and kill them. With all his forces he would pursue Saladin and come upon him from the rear, while the Franks were in front of him, and none would be spared. After Saladin had read the letter, he asked who had written it and was told, 'A Jew'. He was summoned and ordered to be beaten to confess. He immediately declared conversion to Islam and told the whole story. Saladin kept the matter

¹⁴ Thus I interpret *yukthir*. One Ms. reads *yukthir al-qatl* ('kills many people').

¹⁵ According to 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 131) he was killed on Wednesday 25 Dhū'l-Qa'da/20 August 1169. *Sanā al-barq*, 44, has Wednesday 20 Dhū'l-Qa'da.

¹⁶ Literally, the White Well; nowadays the site of 'Izbat Abī Ḥabīb in the district of Bilbays near al-Zawāmil (see *Rawdatayn*, ii, 130, note 4).

secret. However, Mu'tamin al-Khilāfa became anxious and remained close in the palace, too fearful to emerge. When he did, he did not go far and meanwhile Saladin was revealing to him no hint that he was wanted to avoid criticism for that. After this situation had gone on some time, he left the palace to go to a village of his, called al-Kharqāniyya¹⁷ for some recreation. Learning of that, Saladin sent some men to him, who seized and slew him, sending Saladin his head. He dismissed all the eunuchs who ran the affairs of the caliphal palace and appointed over all Bahā' al-Dīn Qarāqūsh, a white eunuch. Nothing, whether minor or major, was undertaken in the palace without his order or on his authority. The black slaves in Old Cairo were angry at the killing of Mu'tamin al-Khilāfa out of loyalty and because he had been strong in their support. They assembled their forces, which numbered more than 50,000, [347] with every intention of making war on Saladin's troops. His force gathered together and met the blacks in Bayn al-Qaṣrayn.¹⁸

On both sides many were killed. Saladin sent to their quarter, known as al-Manṣūra, and burned it down about their possessions, children and womenfolk. When they received intelligence of this, they turned their backs in flight and were harried by the sword. The mouths of the alleys were blocked against them, so they asked for terms after great slaughter had been done on them. Terms were granted and they were sent out of Old Cairo to Giza.¹⁹ Then Shams al-Dawla Ṭūrānshāh, Saladin's brother, crossed over to them with a detachment of the army and annihilated them by the sword. Only the rare fugitive escaped. God Almighty dealt with their wickedness – God knows best!

How Shumla took Fars and was then driven out

This year Shumla, the ruler of Khuzistan, took the land of Fars and was then driven out of it. This came about because Zankī ibn Daklā, its ruler, behaved badly towards his troops, who sent to Shumla in Khuzistan and encouraged him to attack Fars. He gathered his troops, made his preparations and set out. Zankī ibn Daklā came out to meet him and there was a battle between them in which Zankī's men betrayed him. He fled with a small squadron from his army and escaped with his life. He made his way to the Shabankara Kurds and sought refuge with them. Their leader gave him refuge and welcomed him hospitably.

Shumla settled in Fars and established control there. However, he treated its people badly and his nephew, Ibn Sankā, plundered the land, so the people had a

¹⁷ Correct text's Ḥarqāniyya. A small village (originally al-Khāqāniyya) on the east bank of the Nile in Qalyūbiyya (see *Sanā al-barg*, 43 and *Rawdatayn*, ii, 130, note 1).

¹⁸ Literally 'Between the Two Palaces', the open space on the north-south axis of Fatimid Cairo.

¹⁹ According to 'Imād al-Dīn (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 132) this was on Saturday 28 Dhū'l-Qa'da/23 August 1169.

change of heart towards him. Some of the troops who had betrayed Zankī rejoined him after they had seen how badly Shumla ruled over them. Zankī's following among the Shabankara Kurds became numerous [348] and he brought them with him into the country, wrote to his [former] troops and promised them good treatment. After they had turned to him, he marched against Shumla and brought him to battle. Shumla was defeated and Zankī recovered the country and regained power. Shumla returned to his land, Khuzistan.

How Īldikiz took control of Rayy

This year Īldikiz took the city of Rayy and the country which had been in the hands of īnānj. This came about because an agreement had been reached between Īldikiz and īnānj that the latter should pay tribute to the former. He withheld it for two years, so Īldikiz sent demanding the money. īnānj excused himself, pleading the number of his mamlukes and retainers. Thereupon Īldikiz made his preparations and marched against īnānj, who confronted him and fought him fiercely. However, īnānj was defeated and routed. He fortified himself in the castle of Ṭabarak, where Īldikiz besieged him and secretly made contact with a group of his mamlukes. He suborned them with offers of fiefs, money and much goodwill to kill īnānj. They – and they were a large group – killed him and surrendered the place to Īldikiz. He installed 'Umar ibn 'Alī Yāgh there and returned to Hamadhan. He did not fulfil his promises to the mamlukes who had killed īnānj and surrendered the town to him. He said, 'Such men as these are not fit to be taken into service.' He sent them away and they were dispersed throughout the land. One of them, the man who was foremost in the murder of īnānj, went to Khwārazm Shāh. The latter crucified him as punishment for what he had done to his master.

[349] Miscellaneous events

This year in the palace of the Caliph al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh, on a route where the caliph used to ride, a stranger was sighted with a small knife on his forearm and another large knife in his hand.²⁰ He was seized and questioned. He said, 'I am from Aleppo.' He was imprisoned and the gate-keeper punished, although it was not known which way he had entered.

Ibn al-Baladī, the caliph's vizier, arrested al-Husayn ibn Muḥammad, known as Ibn al-Sībī, and his younger brother. They were cousins of 'Aḍud al-Dīn, the major-domo. The younger one was steward of the Hospital and his hand and foot were cut off. It is claimed that he had weights that were heavier [than was legal], for which he was arrested. They were taken to the Diwan with the true standard

²⁰ *Muntazam*, x, 226–7, the source of *Kāmil*, although the details vary, dates this incident to Tuesday 21 Rabī' I/24 December 1168.

weights. Other accounts are given. He was taken to the Hospital, where he died. He was a poet and amongst his poetry are these verses he wrote while in prison:

Greetings to my family, my friends and my companions,
 Whose memory is fixed and anchored in my heart.
 With you I deal with every worry and do not see
 For the sickness of my cares any solace but the sight of you.
 Fate has brought forth for me every misfortune,
 At which livers grow grey, not to mention the head.
 O daughter of ‘Abd Allāh, patience to endure my lot!
 This judgment is from the ruler of mankind.
 Were your eyes to see my humiliation you would weep for me
 with tears roaring like fountains.
 I speak to my heart while cares snatch at it
 And my spirit has spoken to it of trouble and despair.
 If a phantom of my imagination wished to visit you,
 My guards would stop it before the bolted doors.
 My care is only for myself and not for anything else,
 Because I am an ally of poverty and destitution.

The following died this year:

Al-Mu‘ammar ibn ‘Abd al-Wāhid ibn Rajā’,²¹ Abū Aḥmad al-İsfahānī, the *hāfiẓ*.²² He used to transmit [Hadīth] from the students of Abū Nu‘aym. He died in Dhū'l-Qa‘da [27 July–25 August 1169] in the desert while on his way to the Pilgrimage.

[350] In Rajab of this year [April 1169] the Shaykh Abū Muḥammad al-Fāriqī,²³ who used to teach theology. He was an ascetic and is credited with many saintly miracles. He used to teach from memory and his discourses have been collected and are well-known.

Ju‘ayfar the dancer, one of the boon companions of the caliphal palace.

In Shawwāl [28 June–26 July 1169] the Cadi Abū'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā al-Qurashī al-Dimashqī.

In Dhū'l-Ḥijja [26 August–23 September 1169] Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad²⁴ ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī, the cadi of Mosul. His son, Ḥujjat al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Qāhir, succeeded to the office.

²¹ The text reads Rūjjār (Roger!). Rajā' is taken from *Muntażam*, x, 229.

²² i.e. one who knows the Koran by heart.

²³ *Muntażam*, x, 229, which calls him Muḥammad al-Fāriqī, gives his death date as Friday 11 Rajab/=11 April 1169.

²⁴ This notice in *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 230–31, begins ‘In Shawwāl the Cadi Abū'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad’, which appears to have been confused with the preceding entry. The index entry in the Thornberg edition has: Najm al-Dīn Muhammad etc. This member of the Shahrazūrī family of cadis and officials has not been reliably identified.

Account of the Franks' siege of Damietta

During Ṣafar of this year [October 1169]¹ the Franks descended upon Damietta in Egypt and put it under siege. The Franks in Syria, when Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh conquered Egypt, feared him greatly and were convinced that they were doomed. They wrote to the Franks who were in Sicily, Andalusia and elsewhere, appealing for their aid and telling them the latest news about the Turks' conquest of Egypt and that they gave them cause to fear for Jerusalem. They sent a number of priests and monks to urge them into action and in due course they sent supplies of money, men and weapons and made arrangement to descend upon Damietta, in expectation that they would conquer it and take it as a base from which they would conquer Egypt. ‘God turned back the unbelievers in their wrath and they gained no good.’² By the time they arrived Asad al-Dīn had died and Saladin become ruler. They gathered together before Damietta and put it under siege, pressing hard on those within.

Saladin sent troops by the Nile, concentrated all the men he had there and supplied them with money, weapons and stores. He sent to Nūr al-Dīn, complaining of the fearful situation they were in, saying, ‘If I hang back from Damietta, the Franks will take it and if I march [352] there, the Egyptians will make trouble in my rear with Egypt's people and resources³ and they will rebel against me. They will follow on my tail, while the Franks are in front of me and we shall have no chance of survival.’

Nūr al-Dīn sent troops in successive contingents and then he himself moved into the Syrian lands of the Franks, which he plundered, raided and laid waste. Because the lands were devoid of defenders the raids reached into areas not previously touched. When the Franks saw troops arriving continuously in Egypt and Nur al-Dīn entering their own lands, plundering and ruining them, they withdrew disappointed, not having gained anything. They found their territory a ruin and its people either dead or captive. They fitted the saying, ‘The ostrich went forth seeking horns and returned without ears.’

They had been at Damietta for fifty days, during which Saladin expended untold sums of money. I was told that he said, ‘I have never seen anyone more

¹ *Sanā al-Barq*, 45, says 1 Ṣafar/25 October.

² Koran, xxxiii, 25.

³ The sense is not completely clear here. A different third-person version in *Bāhir*, 143, quoted in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 139: ‘If he marches there, the Egyptians will make trouble in his rear among those left behind and those of his army left behind.’

generous than al-‘Ādīd; during the time the Franks were before Damietta he sent me a million Egyptian dinars, apart from clothes and other things.'

Account of Nūr al-Dīn's siege of Kerak

In Jumādā II⁴ this year [20 February–20 March 1170] Nūr al-Dīn marched into Frankish territory and besieged Kerak,⁵ one of the strongest fortresses, on the edge of the desert. This came about because Saladin sent to Nūr al-Dīn requesting him to send him his father, Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb. Nūr al-Dīn equipped him for the journey and sent him on his way, accompanied by some troops. A large host of merchants assembled with him and they were joined by people who had some acquaintance and friendship with Saladin. Nūr al-Dīn feared what the Franks might do to them, so he went with his troops to Kerak, which he besieged and pressed very hard, setting up trebuchets to bombard it. News came to him that [353] the Franks had gathered in response and marched towards him. They had put the son of Humphrey and Philip, son of the count,⁶ in charge of their advance guard, both leading knights of the Franks in their time. Nūr al-Dīn set out towards these two captains to confront them and the troops with them before they were joined by the rest of the Franks. When he drew near them, they retired and joined up with the main body of the Franks.

Nūr al-Dīn marched on through the middle of their land, plundering and burning the villages on his route until he arrived at Muslim territory. He camped at ‘Ashtarā,⁷ where he stayed waiting for the Franks to move, so that he could meet them, but they did not budge from their position. He stayed until he received news of the earthquake that occurred and then he left.

As for Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb, he and the people with him arrived safely in Egypt.⁸ The Caliph al-‘Ādīd came out to meet him to do him honour.

⁴ The parallel passage in *Bāhir*, 144, has Rajab/21 March–19 April 1170. According to ‘Imād al-Dīn (*Sanā al-Barq*, 47; *Rawdatayn*, ii, 150) the move towards Kerak occurred on 1 Sha'bān/20 April.

⁵ See Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 45–52.

⁶ In Arabic ibn Hanfarī; the text then reads Qarīb ibn al-Raqīq, to be emended to Filib etc., according to the version quoted in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 150–51 (cf. *Sanā al-Barq*, 47). The two have been identified as Humphrey of Toron III and Philip of Milly (*Rawdatayn*, loc. cit. in editor's note). ‘Rafiq’ (companion) perhaps stands for ‘comes’ (count), hence ‘Philip, son of the count’.

⁷ Situated 20 miles north of Deraa on the Damascus road.

⁸ Ayyūb arrived on 27 Rajab/16 April 1170 ('Imād al-Dīn in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 149).

Account of a raid by a Nūrid squadron

Shihāb al-Dīn [Muhammad ibn]⁹ Ilyās ibn Īlghāzī ibn Artuq, lord of the castle of Bīra, had come with his troop, two hundred cavalry strong, to Nūr al-Dīn, when he was at ‘Ashtarā. When he arrived at the village of Labwa,¹⁰ in the district of Baalbek, he rode out to hunt and came across three hundred Frankish knights who had set out to raid Muslim territory, on 17 Shawwāl [4 July 1170].¹¹ They fell upon one another and fought a very fierce battle. Both sides held firm, particularly the Muslims, for a thousand horsemen will not [ordinarily] withstand the charge of three hundred Frankish knights. Many were killed on both sides and then the Franks fled, most of them being killed or taken prisoner. None escaped except for persons of little account.

[354] Shihāb al-Dīn took the heads of the dead and also the captives to Nūr al-Dīn, who along with his troops rode out to meet them. Among the heads Nūr al-Dīn saw that of the master of the Hospitallers, the lord of Ḥiṣn al-Akrād. He was brave in the highest degree and a thorn in the Muslims' flesh.¹²

Account of the earthquake and its effect on Syria

On 12 Shāwwāl¹³ of this year [29 June 1170] there were successive, terrifyingly strong earthquake tremors, the like of which had never been seen. They were felt over most of Syria, the Jazīra, Mosul, Iraq and other lands, but were strongest in Syria and destroyed much of Damascus, Baalbek, Homs, Hama, Shayzar, Ba‘rin, Aleppo and elsewhere. Their walls and citadels were demolished and houses collapsed on their inhabitants. Those that perished were too many to count.

When Nūr al-Dīn received the news, he went to Baalbek to repair the damage to its wall and citadel. When, however, the news from the rest of the towns came to him, news of the destruction of their walls and citadels and their abandonment

⁹ ‘Muhammad ibn’ from *Sanā al-barq*, 56. ‘Mahmūd’ in *Bāhir*, 145, and *Rawdatayn*, ii, 160. The name of Shihāb al-Dīn’s father is variously given, mostly Ayāz (see Hillenbrand, *Muslim Principality*, 50, 111, 146) but also as Ilyās (op. cit., 82). Ayāz was the form used previously in *Kāmil* (see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), 172-3, s.a. 509).

¹⁰ Modern Laboue in the Biqā‘ valley near the source of the River Orontes. Cf. Le Strange, *Palestine*, 61.

¹¹ This incident perhaps belongs under the following year. ‘Imād al-Dīn gives a full date (Wednesday 17 Shawwāl in 566/23 June 1171), see *Sanā al-barq*, 56. Abū Shāma (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 180) was aware of the discrepancy. ‘Wednesday’ does not fit the date if the year is 565.

¹² Literally ‘a foreign body in the Muslims’ gullets’. The master may have been Cast de Murols, elected in 1170 and perhaps dead by 1171 (Riley-Smith, *Knights of St John*, 63 and 287).

¹³ *Sanā al-barq*, 47, specifies ‘Monday’ and ‘Imād al-Dīn writes: ‘I was sitting in my tent and I felt the earth heaving beneath me like the sea when howling winds whip it up.’

by the inhabitants, he placed men in Baalbek to repair, protect and guard it and went to Homs, where he did the same, and then to Hama and then on to Ba'rin. He was extremely wary of the danger for the towns from the Franks. Then he came to Aleppo, where he saw effects of the earthquake greater than elsewhere, for it had destroyed it utterly and the survivors were totally terror-stricken. They were unable to shelter in their houses for fear of after-shocks. They remained in the open. Nūr al-Dīn personally took part in the repair work and so continued until he had rebuilt its walls and mosques.

[355] As for Frankish territory, the earthquake tremors also had the same effect there. They were kept busy repairing their towns, fearful of Nūr al-Dīn for them. Each side was occupied with repair work for fear of the other.

Account of the death of Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī and the accession of his son Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī

This year in Dhū'l-Hijja [16 August–13 September 1170]¹⁴ Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur, lord of Mosul, died at Mosul. His illness was a violent fever. When his illness intensified, he willed his kingdom to his eldest son, 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī, but then substituted another son, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, for him. The reason why he diverted the succession from his eldest son 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī was that the person who ran the affairs of his state and controlled them, a eunuch of his, called Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Masīḥ, disliked 'Imād al-Dīn because he was obedient to his uncle Nūr al-Dīn, as he spent much time at his court and was married to his daughter. Nūr al-Dīn also hated 'Abd al-Masīḥ. So Fakhr al-Dīn and the Lady, daughter of Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh ibn Īlghāzī, who was the mother of Sayf al-Dīn, agreed to divert the succession from 'Imād al-Dīn to Sayf al-Dīn. 'Imād al-Dīn set out to his uncle Nūr al-Dīn, seeking his support to help him recover the kingdom for himself.

Quṭb al-Dīn died at the age of about forty years. His rule had lasted twenty-one years and five and a half months. Fakhr al-Dīn was the administrator of affairs and the real power in the state. Quṭb al-Dīn was one of the best conducted of princes and the most respectful of his subjects' property [356] and kind towards them, bestowing much upon them. He was loved by the great and the small and sympathetic towards the noble and the humble. He had a generous character and was a good friend. It is as though the poet had him in mind with these verses:

A nature like rain-water, sweet to the taste,
And a luxuriant meadow, pleasant with breezes;
Like the sword but with ample forbearance

¹⁴ In Shawwāl/18 June–16 July 1170, according to a variant reading in *Kāmil* and according to *Bāhir*, 146 (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 161).

For those who sin, yet the sword is [normally] not forbearing;
 Like the cloud, although the shower of his liberality
 Is lasting, while the cloud's rain is passing;
 Like fate itself, although possessed of mercy,
 While fate is hard-hearted, unforgiving.

He was quick to react to goodness but slow to respond to evil, and full of virtues but with few vices. God have mercy on him and be pleased with him and with all Muslims through His grace and favour; He is indeed a kind and generous one.

Mention of the sort of situation that princes ought to be wary of¹⁵

My father (God have mercy on him) told me the following:

I used to administer Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar for Qutb al-Dīn, as you know. A little time before his death we received a letter from the Diwan in Mosul, ordering that all the orchards of al-‘Uqayma be assessed by survey. This ‘Uqayma is a village facing Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] across the Tigris, which had many orchards. Some of them are surveyed and a fixed sum taken from each *jarīb*, some pay a *kharāj* and yet others are free of everything.¹⁶ I had substantial property there and I used to say, ‘The best policy is for nothing to be changed for people’, and I did not say this for the sake of my property, for mine was surveyed property. I simply [357] wanted people to continue to bless the dynasty. However, the deputy’s¹⁷ letter came to me, saying, ‘Surveying is essential’, and I made this order public. There was a group of godly people there with whom I was on good terms as a friend. All the people came to me, including these persons, asking for reconsideration. I informed them that I had already asked and been refused. Two men, whom I knew to be God-fearing, came to me and requested me to refer the matter back and make a further petition. I did so, but measuring was still insisted on.

Only a few days later these two men came to me and when I saw them, I thought that they had come to ask for a further appeal. I was astonished at them and began making excuses, but they said, ‘We have not come to you about that. We have come to tell you that our business has been dealt with.’ I thought that

¹⁵ A more detailed version of this section found in *Bāhir*, 147–8, with the title ‘An incident that encourages just dealing’.

¹⁶ Crops on surveyed (*mamsūh*) land were assessed at specific rates per area cultivated. *Kharāj* land paid a proportion of the crop. The administration in Mosul clearly wanted to maximize its revenue. Note in *Bāhir*, 147: ‘Owners of surveyed land only gained a paltry (*qarīb*) sum from it.’ In the Middle Ages a *jarīb* measured 1592 sq. m. Nowadays in Iran it equals a hectare (see Hinz, 65–6).

¹⁷ *Bāhir*, 147, names Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Masīh.

they had sent to Mosul to someone to intercede for them. I asked, ‘Who has spoken up about this at Mosul?’ They replied, ‘Our business has been settled in heaven and for all the people of ‘Uqayma.’ I imagined that this was something they had convinced themselves of. Then they left me. Not ten days passed before we received a letter from Mosul, ordering the cancellation of surveying, release of those imprisoned, annulment of non-canonical taxes and distribution of alms. It was said, ‘The sultan’ meaning Quṭb al-Dīn, ‘is ill, that is, in a serious condition’. Two or three days later the letter announcing his death arrived. I was astonished at what the two men had said and I believed it to be a miracle of their doing.

After that my father began to show them much honour and respect and pay visits to them.

[358] Account of the battle between the troops of the son of ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn and Ibn Mardanīsh

Muhammad ibn Sa‘īd ibn Mardanīsh had taken control of the east of Andalusia, having formed an alliance with the Franks. He resisted ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn and his son after him and his position became very powerful, especially after the death of ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn. When the present year came, Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn sent large forces against him led by his brother, ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn. They spied out his lands and ravaged them and took two towns of his. They terrified his standing troops and his levies, remaining in his lands for a while, moving through them and collecting money from them.

Account of the death of the lord of Kerman and dissension among his sons

During this year the Prince Ṭughril ibn Qāwurt, lord of Kerman, died and his sons, Bahrām Shāh and Arslān Shāh, the elder, had a disagreement, which led to a battle between them in which Bahrām Shāh was defeated along with a brother of his named Turkān Shāh. Arslān Shāh seized the country, while Bahrām Shāh went to Khurasan. He waited upon al-Mu’ayyad, lord of Nishapur, and sought his aid. He was helped with troops whom he led to Kerman. A battle ensued between the two brothers in which Bahrām Shāh was victorious. Arslān Shāh fled and made his way to Isfahan, seeking refuge with Īldikiz. The latter supplied him with an army which recovered the country from Bahrām Shāh and handed it over to his brother Arslān Shāh. Bahrām Shāh returned to Nishapur, seeking refuge with its ruler, al-Mu’ayyad, and staying at his court. It then happened that his brother Arslān Shāh died, so he went to Kerman, seized it and dwelt there without any rival.

[359] Miscellaneous events

This year much damage and loss was caused by ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Atā’.¹⁸ He descended upon the land of Hulwan, ravaging and destroying. He attacked the pilgrims and so an army was sent against him from Baghdad, which besieged and blockaded him in his castles. They plundered his and his family’s property, so that eventually he announced his obedience and that he would not again harm the pilgrims or others. The army then retired.

There died this year the following:

Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn al-Dāya, Nūr al-Dīn’s foster-brother and his most esteemed emir.¹⁹ He had a fief at Aleppo, Ḥarim and Qal’at Ja‘bar. After his death Nūr al-Dīn passed on all his possessions to his brother, Shams al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn al-Dāya.

Aḥmad ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Shāfi‘, Abū'l-Faḍl al-Jīlī,²⁰ in Sha‘bān [20 April-18 May 1170] at Baghdad. He was one of the renowned scholars of Ḥadīth²¹

¹⁸ Unidentified. This is the only reference to him in *Kāmil*.

¹⁹ He died in Ramaḍān/19 May-17 June 1170 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 141).

²⁰ Born in 520/1126 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 230-31).

²¹ At this point Ibn al-Athīr clarifies the spelling of al-Jīlī to avoid confusion that might arise in a Ms. written without diacritical points.

Account of the death of al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh

In Rabī‘ II of this year [December 1170]¹ al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh Abū'l-Muẓaffar Yūsuf ibn al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh Abī 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn al-Mustazhir bi-Allāh died. The remainder of his lineage has already been given in a different place. His mother was an *umm walad*, called Tā'üs [Peacock]² or, it is claimed, Narjis [Narcissus], a Greek. He was born on 1 Rabī‘ II in the year 510 [13 August 1116]³ and his caliphate lasted eleven years, one month and six days. He was swarthy, well-built and had a long beard.

His death occurred as follows. He fell ill and his illness worsened. The major-domo 'Aqūd al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj, son of Ra'īs al-Ru'asā', and Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz al-Muqtawī, the senior emir of Baghdad at that time, had been fearful of the caliph. When his illness worsened, they conspired together and persuaded the doctor to recommend some treatment that would be harmful to him. He recommended a visit to the bath-house. The caliph refused because of his weak state, but later he did enter and the door were locked on him. As a result he died. This is as I have heard it from more than one who was aware of the circumstances.

It is also said that the caliph wrote to his vizier by his doctor Ibn Ṣafiya, ordering him to arrest the major-domo and Quṭb al-Dīn and crucify them. Ibn Ṣafiya met with the major-domo and gave him the caliph's written order. 'Go back,' said the major-domo, 'and say that you have delivered the order to the vizier.' This he did. The major-domo summoned Quṭb al-Dīn, Yazdan and the latter's brother Tunāmish and showed them the order. They agreed to kill the caliph. Yazdan and Qāymāz al-Hamīdī came to him and carried him to the bath-house, while he was appealing for help. [361] They threw him in and locked the door on him. He continued to call out until he died (God have mercy on him).

His vizier at this time was Abū Ja'far Ibn al-Baladī, between whom and the major-domo there was an inveterate enmity, because al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh was ordering him [the vizier] to do certain things that concerned the two of them [the major-domo and Quṭb al-Dīn], which the vizier would carry out. They were both thinking that he [the vizier] was the one who was undermining their position. When al-Mustanjid fell ill and there were rumours that he had died, the vizier rode

¹ *Muntaẓam*, x, 236, specifies Saturday 8 Rabī‘ II/19 December 1170. Ibn al-Jawzī attended prayers for him the following day. *Saṇā al-barq*, 53, incorrectly dates the accession of al-Mustadī to Saturday 9 Rabī‘ II (*sic*) and *Bāhir*, 150, also has 9 Rabī‘ II.

² She had died on Tuesday 17 Sha'bān 565/ = 5 May 1170 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 231).

³ If his birth and death dates are correct, then the statement in *Muntaẓam*, x, 236, that he died aged 48 years cannot be true.

out fully equipped with the emirs, troops and others but he learned no certain news of the caliph's death. 'Aḍud al-Dīn sent to him, saying, 'The illness of the Commander of the Faithful has eased. Full recovery is expected.' The vizier feared to enter the caliphal palace with troops, for he would perhaps be censured for that. He therefore returned to his house and his followers dispersed. 'Aḍud al-Dīn and Quṭb al-Dīn had prepared to flee when the vizier rode out, fearing that, if he entered the palace, he would arrest them. When he withdrew, the major-domo locked the palace gates and announced the death of al-Mustanjid. He and Quṭb al-Dīn summoned the caliph's son, Abū'l-Muhammad al-Hasan, and proclaimed him caliph, giving him the title al-Mustaḍī bi-Amr Allāh, and they imposed some conditions on him, namely that 'Aḍud al-Dīn should be vizier, his son Kamāl al-Dīn the major-domo and Quṭb al-Dīn the commander of the army. The caliph accepted this.⁴

No one named al-Hasan held the office of caliph other than al-Hasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and this al-Mustaḍī bi-Amr Allāh. They shared the same *kunya* and noble nature. The people of his house swore allegiance to him at a special ceremony on the day his father died and people at large did so at a public ceremony the following day in the Tāj. He delivered justice much more than his father had done and distributed considerable sums of money.

The vizier, Ibn al-Baladī, learning of this, was dismayed and gnashed his teeth in useless regret for his mistake in returning home. He was visited by persons with an invitation to attend the session of condolence and the proclamation of al-Mustaḍī. He went to the caliphal palace and, after he had entered, was taken aside somewhere, killed and dismembered [362] and then thrown into the Tigris (God have mercy on him).⁵ Everything in his house was taken. The two saw written orders of al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh there, in which he ordered the vizier to arrest them and a note in the vizier's hand that queried this and persuaded him to drop it. Having read these, they realized that he was innocent of what they had suspected him of. They regretted having overstepped the mark in killing him.

Al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh was one of the best caliphs as a ruler over his subjects, just towards them and very sollicitous. He abolished many non-canonical taxes and did not leave a single one in Iraq. He was severe on trouble-makers, evil-doers and those who informed on people maliciously. I have heard that he arrested a man who used to inform on people and kept him in prison for a long time. A courtier who was in his special service interceded for this man and offered 10,000 dinars on his behalf. The caliph said, 'I shall give you 10,000 dinars and you can bring

⁴ The new caliph was born 6 Sha'bān 536/6 March 1142. His mother was an Armenian, called Ghadḍa (Tender). See *Muntażam*, x, 232–3.

⁵ He had punished a man and a woman for 'a crime' by having their nose and a hand cut off. He was at this time handed over by the major-domo to the families who retaliated, before he was dispatched and thrown into the river (*Muntażam*, x, 233).

me another man similar to him, so that I can save the people from his evil' and did not release him. He restored much money to its owners and arrested the Cadi Ibn al-Murakhkhim and seized much money from him, which he also returned to its owners. Ibn al-Murakhkhim was wicked and oppressive in his judgments.

How Nūr al-Dīn gained Mosul and confirmed Sayf al-Dīn in control there

When Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd heard of the death of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd, lord of Mosul, the accession of the latter's son Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī to Mosul and the lands which had been his father's and that Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Masīḥ had taken control of affairs alongside him and exercised authority over him, he was outraged at that and found it too much to bear, for he hated Fakhr al-Dīn because of the reports he heard about his harsh administration. [363] He said, 'I am fitter to guide my nephews and their rule.' On the completion of mourning he set out, lightly equipped, with a small body of troops, crossed the Euphrates at Qal'at Ja'bār on 1 Muḥarram this year [14 September 1170] and made for Raqqā, which he besieged and took. Then he went to Khābūr [district] and he took it all and also Nisibis, where he remained gathering troops. Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā'ūd, lord of Ḥiṣn Kayfā, came to him. This swelled his numbers because he had left most of his troops in Syria to guard the frontiers. When his force had assembled, he marched to Sinjār and put it under siege, erecting trebuchets to attack it. It fell to him and he handed it to 'Imād al-Dīn, his brother Quṭb al-Dīn's son.

He had secretly received letters from the emirs in Mosul, offering him their allegiance and urging him to come to them. He set out for Mosul, came to the town of Balad, crossed the Tigris to the eastern bank by a ford nearby and moved on to make camp east of Mosul at the castle of Nineveh with the Tigris between him and Mosul. It is remarkable that the day he made camp a large section of the Mosul city wall fell down.

Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī and Fakhr al-Dīn had sent 'Izz al-Dīn Maṣ'ūd ibn Quṭb al-Dīn to Atabeg Shāms al-Dīn Īldikiz, lord of Hamadhan and the Uplands, Azerbaijan, Isfahan, Rayy and those districts, to seek aid against his uncle Nūr al-Dīn. Īldikiz sent an envoy to Nūr al-Dīn forbidding him to interfere with Mosul and saying, 'These lands are the sultan's. Do not attack them.' He paid no attention to him, however, and said to the envoy, 'Say to your master, "I am better for my nephews than you are. Why do you insert yourself between us? When I have finished settling their lands, my conversation with you will continue at the gates of Hamadhan. You have conquered these vast lands but you have neglected the frontiers with the result that the Georgians have overwhelmed them. I have been tested, possessing the equivalent [364] of a quarter of your territory, by the Franks, the bravest of people, but I have taken most of their land and captured their princes. It is not right for me to hold my tongue about you. We are obliged to

undertake to protect what you have neglected and to free the Muslims from oppression.””

Nūr al-Dīn remained at Mosul. The emirs within determined to rise openly against Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Masīḥ and surrender the city to Nūr al-Dīn. Fakhr al-Dīn learnt of this and made contact with Nūr al-Dīn about his surrendering the city on condition that it remain in the hands of Sayf al-Dīn and requesting guarantees for his life and property. This was agreed but Nūr al-Dīn stipulated that he would take Fakhr al-Dīn with him to Syria and give him an acceptable fief there. He took over the city on 13 Jumādā I this year [22 January 1171] and entered the citadel by the privy gate for, when he heard of Fakhr al-Dīn’s rebellion against him, he had sworn that he would only enter it by the most secure place there. After taking charge at Mosul he cancelled the non-canonical taxes and other categories of abuse there. He did the same at Nisibis, Sinjār and Khābūr. It was like this in all his lands, Syria and Egypt.

While besieging Mosul there came to him a robe of honour from the Caliph al-Mustadī’ bi-Amr Allāh, which he donned, but after his taking Mosul he invested Sayf al-Dīn, his nephew, with it and ordered him, while he was still at Mosul, to build the Nūrī Mosque. He rode in person to its site and viewed it. He climbed the minaret of the mosque of Abū Ḥādir, looked down on the site of his mosque and ordered that the neighbouring houses and shops should be added to the land that he viewed but that nothing should be taken without the willing agreement of the owners. He put the Shaykh ‘Umar al-Mallā’ in charge of the project, a pious and good man.⁶ The properties were purchased from their owners at most substantial prices and the construction began, on which large sums were expended. The building was completed in the year 568 [1172-3].

Nūr al-Dīn returned to Syria and left as his deputy in the citadel of Mosul a eunuch, whose name was [365] Kumushtakīn and whose honorific Sa’d al-Dīn. He ordered Sayf al-Dīn not to act independently of him in any matter, great or small, and gave him full authority throughout the land. He assigned Sinjār as a fief to ‘Imād al-Dīn, his brother Quṭb al-Dīn’s son. After he had done this, Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Shahrazūrī said, ‘This is a path that will lead to trouble for the house of the Atabeg, because ‘Imād al-Dīn is senior [in age] and will not countenance being subject to Sayf al-Dīn, while Sayf al-Dīn, holding the [most powerful] princedom, will not countenance indulgence towards ‘Imād al-Dīn. Dissension will be the result and enemies will be encouraged.’ That was indeed what happened, as we shall relate under the year 570 [1174-5]. Nūr al-Dīn stayed in

⁶ He was called al-Mallā’ because he filled (*mala’ā*) lime-pits for a living. His ascetic life and religious knowledge gave him a large following among the learned, princes and emirs. He encouraged Nūr al-Dīn to build a mosque ‘on a broad waste in the centre of the city’ (‘Imād al-Dīn in *Rawḍatayn*, ii, 171-2, also *Sanā’ al-barq*, 52). His unsuitability for the project was urged but Nūr al-Dīn believed that he would not be corrupt, unlike an emir or administrator (*Bāhir*, 170).

Mosul for twenty-four days. He took Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Masīḥ away with him and changed his name,⁷ calling him ‘Abd Allāh. He assigned him a large fief.

Account of Saladin's raid on Frankish territory and the conquest of Ayla

In this year Saladin also went into Frankish territory from Egypt and raided the districts of Ascalon and Ramla. He attacked and sacked the suburbs of Gaza. The king of the Franks came swiftly with a small band of his troops to drive him back from his lands. Saladin fought and defeated them. The Frankish king escaped after having been on the point of being taken prisoner.

Saladin returned to Egypt and constructed some boats in sections which he transported overland in pieces on camels. He came to Ayla,⁸ fitted the pieces of the boats together and launched them on the sea. He besieged Ayla by land and by sea and conquered it during the first ten days of Rabi' II [12–21 December 1170]. He allowed the inhabitants and all it contained to be plundered and then returned to Egypt.⁹

[366] Account of what Saladin purposed in Egypt this year

In Old Cairo there was a building for the police, known as the House of Assistance (*Dār al-Ma'ūna*), where anyone they wanted to imprison was confined. Saladin demolished it, rebuilt it as a madrasah for the Shāfi'īs and did away with the tyranny that had been associated with it. He also rebuilt the Hall of Justice as a madrasah for the Shāfi'īs. The Fatimid cadiis, who were Shiites, were suppressed and he established a Shāfi'īi cadi in Old Cairo, who then appointed deputy Shāfi'īi cadiis throughout all the country, on 20 Jumādā II [28 February 1171].¹⁰

Miscellaneous events

This year Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar, Saladin's nephew, purchased the Abodes of Glory (*Manāzil al-'Izz*) at Old Cairo¹¹ and refashioned the building as a madrasah for the Shāfi'īs.

⁷ ‘Abd al-Masīḥ means ‘servant of the Messiah’.

⁸ i.e. ‘Aqabat Ayla, east of modern Elat on the Gulf of Aqaba.

⁹ This expedition was partly to meet a caravan from Damascus that was bringing members of his family. He returned to Cairo 26 Jumādā I/4 February 1171 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 181–2).

¹⁰ On 22 Jumādā II/2 March, according to *Rawdatayn*, ii, 181. The cadi appointed was Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Dirbās.

¹¹ This had been a pleasure palace of the Fatimids on the Nile. It was acquired by Taqī al-Dīn on 15 Sha'bān/23 April 1171 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 182).

This year Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh, Saladin's brother, raided the Bedouin of Upper Egypt, who had caused disturbance in the country and robbed widely. They then refrained from what they had been doing.

The Cadi Ibn al-Khallāl, one of the leading Egyptian secretaries and scholars, died this year. He was the head of the Chancery Bureau there.

This year there was a fire at Baghdad in Kitchen Road and in the Waste of Ibn Jarada.

[367] The Emir Naṣr, son of al-Mustażhir bi-Allāh and uncle and father-in-law of al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh, died this year. He was the last of the sons of al-Mustażhir bi-Allāh to die and his death was in Dhū'l-Qa'da [August 1171]. He was buried in the cemetery at Ruṣāfa.¹²

This year Ẓahīr al-Dīn Abū Bakr Naṣr ibn al-'Aṭṭār was appointed head of the Storeroom at Baghdad and given his honorific title Ẓahīr al-Dīn.

The Emir Ṭāṣhtakīn al-Mustanjidī led the people as emir of the Pilgrimage and he was excellent in the post (God have mercy on him).

¹² Ibn al-Jawzī calls him Abū Naṣr and gives his death date as Tuesday 28 Dhū'l-Qa'da/= 3 August 1171 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 236).

Account of the establishment of the Abbasid khutbah in Egypt and the end of the Fatimid Alid dynasty

This year on the second Friday in Muḥarram [=10 September 1171] the khutbah in the name of al-‘Ādīd li-Dīn Allāh Abū Muḥammad Imām ‘Abd Allāh was dropped.¹ The khutbah for the Abbasids came about because Saladin became well established in Egypt, his rivals were removed and the position of the Caliph al-‘Ādīd weakened. His palace came to be controlled by Saladin and his deputy Qarāqūsh, a eunuch who was one of the leaders of the Asadī emirs,² all of whom looked to him. Nūr al-Dīn wrote to him ordering that the khutbah in the name of al-‘Ādīd should be dropped and that it should be made in the name of al-Muṣṭadī’. Saladin declined, pleading his fear of a rising against him by the people of Egypt because of their Alid sympathies.

Saladin was unwilling to drop the Fatimids' khutbah and wanted to continue them because of his fear of Nūr al-Dīn. He feared that he might enter Egypt and take it from him. He wanted al-‘Ādīd to be with him, so that, if Nūr al-Dīn came against him, he could resist, relying on him and the Egyptians. [369] When he made his excuses to Nūr al-Dīn, he did not accept them but insisted on having the khutbah dropped and put pressure on him that allowed him no scope for disagreement, for he was in reality Nūr al-Dīn's lieutenant.

It chanced that al-‘Ādīd fell very seriously ill at this time. When Saladin resolved to drop the khutbah, he consulted his emirs. Some of them advised that it be done and gave no thought to the Egyptians; others were fearful of them, although it was impossible to do anything other than obey Nūr al-Dīn's order. There had recently come to Egypt a Persian, known as 'the Scholar Emir',³ whom I saw at Mosul. When he saw their state of hesitation and that nobody dared make the khutbah for the Abbasids, he said, 'I shall be the first to make the khutbah for them', and on the first Friday of Muḥarram [=3 September 1171], he ascended the pulpit before the preacher and made the bidding prayer for al-Muṣṭadī' bi-Amr Allāh and no one expressed any disapproval. Come the second Friday

¹ The text lists his genealogy back to the first Fatimid, the Mahdi Abū Muḥammad ‘Ubayd Allāh, which it seems unnecessary to give here.

² i.e. the emirs who had been in the service of Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh.

³ In Arabic *al-amīr al-‘ālim*. He is identified as Najm al-Dīn Abū'l-Barakāt Muḥammad ibn al-Muwaffaq al-Khabūshānī (see *Rawdatayn*, ii, 191, note 1). According to 'Imād al-Dīn (*Sanā al-barq*, 110; *Rawdatayn*, ii, 190, 431) the first khutbah was made by Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ... ibn Abī'l-Maḍā' al-Ba'labakkī, who died eve of Friday 12 Ṣafar 572/20 August 1176.

[=10 September], Saladin ordered the preachers in Old and New Cairo to drop the khutbah for al-‘Ādīd and make it in the name of al-Mustadī’. This they did and no two goats locked horns over it. He then sent letters to all the rest of Egypt ordering this step and it was done. Meanwhile, al-‘Ādīd had become seriously ill and no one of his family or retainers told him of the dropping of the khutbah. They said, ‘If he recovers, then he will get to know, but if he is to die, it is not right to distress him with this turn of events before he does.’ He died on the day of ‘Āshūrā’ [13 September 1171], still unaware of the dropping of the khutbah.

After his death, Saladin attended a session of condolence and then took over the caliphal palace and all its contents. Bahā’ al-Dīn Qarāqūsh, whom Saladin had appointed before al-‘Ādīd’s death, took charge of it and brought everything to Saladin. There was so much that it was beyond counting, comprising precious objects and strange items, the like of which no longer exist and such gems as none other has possessed, including the ‘ruby mountain’ that weighed seventeen dirhams or seventeen mithqāls. I am sure of this because I saw it and weighed it.⁴ There were also pearls without parallel and an emerald sword hilt, four fingers long and the width of a large necklace. A drum was found there, which had been close to al-‘Ādīd’s apartment and which had been surrounded with special care. [370] When they saw it, they thought that it had been made as a toy and they mocked al-‘Ādīd. A man picked it up and banged it and immediately farted. They all laughed at him. Another did likewise. Each man that beat it farted. One of them threw it down and broke it. It appeared that the drum was for colic, so, when told that, they regretted breaking it.⁵ There was also an untold quantity of precious and rare books. Everything there was put up for sale.

Al-‘Ādīl’s family was taken to a place in the palace and put into the care of guards. Every slave-woman or male slave there was removed and some were sold, some given their freedom and others given away. The palace became devoid of inhabitants, as though it had not formerly thronged with life. Glory be to the Living, Eternal God, whose realm has no end, whom ages change not and whose sanctuary decay comes not near.

When al-‘Ādīd’s illness became critical, he sent to summon Saladin but he thought that it was a trap and did not go to him. After his death Saladin learnt that he had been sincere and repented of his failure to visit him. Often he used to describe him as a generous and gentle man, who by nature was wholly good and tractable. Among his ancestors were nine who had been recognized as caliph, namely al-Hāfiẓ, al-Mustansīr, al-Zāhir, al-Hākim, al-‘Azīz, al-Mu’izz, al-Manṣūr,

⁴ There is no further explanation of this. This ruby can hardly be the same as the one that Nūr al-Dīn lost and found (see above under the year 559).

⁵ *Bāhir*, 157, mentions ‘an emerald sceptre (*qaḍīb*)’. Ibn Abī Ṭayy (in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 209-10) also mentions the sceptre ‘a span and a fraction long and as thick as a thumb’ which Saladin broke in three pieces and gave to his women and adds: ‘A drum to treat colic fell into the hands of a Kurd, who did not know what it was but smashed it because he broke wind when he beat it.’

al-Qā'im and al-Mahdī. Among those who had not been caliph were his father Yūsuf, son of al-Hāfiẓ, and his great-grandfather, the Emir Abū'l-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn al-Mustanṣir. That leaves those who became caliph but were not his direct ancestors: al-Musta'ī, al-Āmir, al-Zāfir and al-Fā'iz. In total fourteen of them were proclaimed caliph, those in Ifrīqiya being al-Mahdī, al-Qā'im, al-Manṣūr, al-Mu'izz until he went to Egypt, and those in Egypt being al-Mu'izz the aforementioned, the first to go there from Ifrīqiya, al-'Azīz, al-Hākim, al-Zāhir, al-Mustansir, al-Musta'ī, al-Āmir, al-Hāfiẓ, al-Zāfir, al-Fā'iz and al-'Āḍid. The whole period of their rule from the time that al-Mahdī appeared at Sijilmāsa in Dhū'l-Hijja of the year 299 [July–August 912] until the death of al-'Āḍid was 272 [*sic!*] years [371] and one month approximately.

This is the way of the world. It never gives without taking back, is never sweet without turning bitter and is never pure without becoming muddied. Indeed, its 'purity' is never free of mire, but its mire often lacks purity. We pray God Almighty to turn our hearts towards Him, to show us the world as it really is, to make us reject it and desire the Life-to-come. He hears our prayer and is quick to answer.

When the good news arrived at Baghdad, the celebratory drums were sounded for several days and Baghdad was decorated. Unbounded joy and rejoicing were manifested and robes of honour were sent to Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin with 'Imād al-Dīn Ṣandal, one of the special servants of al-Muqtāfi's time and one of the foremost men in the state. Ṣandal came to Nūr al-Dīn and invested him with the robe and sent other robes to Saladin and the preachers in Egypt, along with black banners. Later this Ṣandal became major-domo of the Caliph al-Mustaḍī bi-Amr Allāh at Baghdad. He was knowledgeable in jurisprudence according to the Shāfi'i school, both heard and transmitted Ḥadīth and knew good things. He was a religious man who did much good, one of the ornaments of Baghdad.

Account of the deep difference between Nūr al-Dīn and Saladin

This year things happened that brought it about that Nūr al-Dīn was upset by Saladin but he did not reveal this. This came about as follows. Saladin marched from Egypt to raid Frankish territory this year in Ṣafar [October 1171].⁶ He descended upon the fortress of Shawbak,⁷ which is about a day's journey from Kerak, and put it under siege, pressing hard on the Frankish garrison. After a long struggle [372] they asked for terms and a delay of ten days. This was granted.

When Nūr al-Dīn heard what Saladin had done, he left Damascus, also making for Frankish territory to enter it from another direction. Saladin was told: 'If Nūr

⁶ According to *Bāhir*, 158, he had moved out of Cairo on 20 Muḥarram/23 September 1171. 'Imād al-Dīn (*Rawḍatayn*, ii, 226–7) has 22 Muḥarram.

⁷ Otherwise Montreal, south of the Dead Sea towards Petra (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 23ff).

al-Dīn enters the lands of the Franks while they are in this situation, you on one side and Nūr al-Dīn on another, he will conquer them and when the Franks are cleared from his route and their king taken, with Nūr al-Dīn there will be no place left in Egypt. If Nūr al-Dīn comes to you here, you will have to meet him and then he will exercise his authority over you as he wishes. If he wishes, he will leave you alone and if he wishes, he will dismiss you and you will be unable to resist. Your politic course is to return to Egypt.'

Saladin then withdrew from Shawbak to return to Egypt,⁸ without taking it from the Franks. He wrote to Nūr al-Dīn, excusing himself because of the unsettled state of Egypt due to matters he had heard about the Alid Shia, that they were purposing a coup. He feared, because of his distance from Egypt, that the former establishment would rise against his men left behind, expel them and become well entrenched again. He made his excuses at length but Nūr al-Dīn did not accept them. His attitude towards him changed and he resolved to enter Egypt and expel him.

This became public and Saladin heard the report. He gathered his family, including his father Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb and his maternal uncle Shihāb al-Dīn al-Hārimī, along with other emirs and informed them of Nūr al-Dīn's plan and proposed expedition that he had heard of. He asked their advice but not one gave him a word in reply. Then his nephew Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar stood up and said, 'If he comes to us, we shall fight him and keep him out of the country.' Others agreed with him, but Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb reprimanded them and expressed his disapproval and horror at this opinion. He reprimanded Taqī al-Dīn and made him sit down. To Saladin he said, 'I am your father and this is your uncle Shihāb al-Dīn. We love you more than all those you see here. By God, if your uncle and I were to set eyes on Nūr al-Dīn, we could do nothing but kiss the ground before him. If he ordered us to strike off your head with a sword, we would do so. If this is how we are, what do you think about others? All the emirs you see before you now, if they saw Nūr al-Dīn by himself, would not dare to [373] remain in their saddles. This country is his. We are his mamlukes and lieutenants in it. If he wishes to dismiss you, we shall hear and obey. Your best course is to write a letter by a courier, saying in it, "I have heard that you intend an expedition to secure the country. What need is there for that? Let my lord send a courier to place a kerchief on my neck⁹ and take me to you. Here there is no one who will resist you."

He dismissed the emirs and others, who all dispersed thereupon. When Ayyūb was alone with him, he said to him, 'With what sort of intelligence have you acted? Do you not realize that, if Nūr al-Dīn hears of your intention to resist him and fight, he will make us his most important consideration. Then you will be powerless against him. But now, when he hears what has happened and of our loyalty to him, he will leave us alone and occupy himself with others and fate will

⁸ Saladin returned to Cairo 15 Rabī' I/16 November 1171 (*Sanā al-barq*, 62).

⁹ *Bāhir*, 159: 'put a rope around my neck'.

take its course. By God, if Nūr al-Dīn wanted [as much as] a piece of sugar cane I myself would fight him to stop him or be killed [in the attempt].’ Saladin did what he advised and Nūr al-Dīn gave up his purpose and busied himself with other matters. It turned out as Ayyūb expected. Nūr al-Dīn died without having made a move against him and Saladin ruled the land. This was an example of really good and excellent advice.¹⁰

Account of a raid against the Franks in Syria

This year two ships set out for Syria from Egypt and anchored at the port of Lattakia. The Franks seized these, full of goods and merchants. Between them and Nūr al-Dīn there was a truce which they treacherously broke. Nūr al-Dīn sent to them about the matter and about their restoring the merchants’ property they had taken. They tried to deceive him and put forward some excuses, one being that the ships had been holed and had taken on water. It was the case that they could seize any boat that might be damaged and sink. Nūr al-Dīn did not accept [374] their lies and gathered his troops. He sent squadrons through their lands, some towards Antioch and others towards Tripoli. He himself besieged ‘Arqa and destroyed its suburb. He also sent a detachment of his troops to the castle of Ṣāfīthā and to ‘Urayma, both of which he took by assault. He sacked and destroyed and the Muslims gained much booty. They returned to him at ‘Arqa and then he set out with all his troops until he drew close to Tripoli, plundering, destroying, burning and killing. Those that went to Antioch did in that province the same that he did in the province of Tripoli. The Franks made contact with him and offered to restore what they had taken from the two ships and to renew the truce. This was accepted, so they gave back, in all humility, what they had seized, after their lands had been ruined and their property taken as booty.¹¹

Account of the death of ibn Mardanīsh and the rule of Abū Ya‘qūb ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn

This year there died Emir Muḥammad ibn Sa’d ibn Mardanīsh, lord of the eastern lands of Andalusia, namely Murcia, Valencia and others. His testament to his sons was that after his death they should seek out Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn, lord of the Maghrib and Andalusia, surrender the lands to him and enter into his allegiance. When he died, they did go to Yūsuf, who had already,

¹⁰ This approbation, despite the author’s pro-Zankid tendency, is noteworthy. No irony appears to be intended.

¹¹ The restitution of property proved difficult. Ibn al-Athīr’s father eventually recovered some textiles he had had on board with two partners, one a local Christian, whose honesty (‘rare in these days’) was commended (*Bāhir*, 155).

before the death of Ibn Mardanīsh, crossed to Andalusia with 100,000 fighting men. Yūsuf,¹² when he saw them, was delighted and pleased at their coming to him. He took over their lands and married their sister, while he treated them with honour and respect, giving them vast sums of money. They remained in his service.

[375] Account of the Qarakhitay's crossing of the Oxus and the battle between them and Khwārazm Shāh

This year the Qarakhitay crossed the river Oxus making for Khwārazm. Its ruler, Khwārazm Shāh [Īl] Arslān ibn Atsiz, heard of this and assembled his armies and then marched to Āmūye¹³ to fight and drive them back. However, he fell ill, so remained where he was and sent part of his army with a senior emir to confront them. They met and fought a fierce battle. The men of Khwārazm were defeated and their commander taken prisoner. The Qarakhitay took him with them to Transoxania, while Khwārazm Shāh returned, still ill, to Khwārazm.

Miscellaneous events

This year Nūr al-Dīn began the use of homing pigeons in Syria. They are the ones that used to be called ‘pedigrees’ (*manāsīb*) and fly back to their lofts from lands far away. He made them ready throughout his lands. The reason for this was that, when his lands became extensive, his realm increased and its bounds broadened, so that where one part began became distant from the other end. When they became contiguous with Frankish lands, often the latter would descend upon a frontier fortress and before he could learn of this and march against them they would have attained their purpose, so he ordered carrier pigeons to be able to receive news immediately. He provided regular pay for the men he appointed to keep and maintain them. The pigeons provided great relief and significant advantage for the Muslims.

This year the Caliph al-Mustaḍī bi-Amr Allāh dismissed his vizier, ‘Aḍud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj, son of Ra'is al-Ru'asā', although unwillingly because Quṭb al-Dīn Qaymāz forced him to dismiss him and he was not able to oppose him.

The following died this year:

Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Khashshāb, the linguist. He was well versed [376] in literary Arabic and studied Ḥadīth a lot until his death.¹⁴

¹² The text has some confusion between ‘Yūsuf’ and ‘Ya'qūb’ in this section.

¹³ More commonly called Āmul al-Shaṭṭ, it is on the west bank of the Oxus, a main crossing point on the Marv-Bukhara road. See Krawulsky, 65, and sources there cited.

¹⁴ On Friday 3 Ramaḍān = 28 April 1172 (*Muntazam*, x, 238).

Al-Būrī, the Shāfi‘ī canon-lawyer.¹⁵ He studied with Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā, came to Baghdad where he preached. He used to criticize the Ḥanbalīs and his following grew numerous. He was afflicted by diarrhoea and died, he and also several of his followers. It is said that the Ḥanbalīs gave him a present of some sweetmeat. He died, as did all who ate any of it.

Al-Qurṭubī, Abū Bakr Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘dūn ibn Tammām al-Azdī. He was a leading scholar of Koran recitation, grammar and other sciences, an ascetic and pious man. Many benefited from him in Mosul and that is where he died.

¹⁵ In *Muntazam*, x, 239, he is called Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ..., Abū'l-Muzaffar al-Barawī (?). He was an Asharite and died during Ramaḍān/April-May 1172.

Account of the death of Khwārazm Shāh [Īl] Arslān and the accession of his son Sultān Shāh, followed by his other son Tekesh, and also of the death of al-Mu'ayyad and the coming to power of his son

This year Khwārazm Shāh [Īl] Arslān ibn Atsiz ibn Muḥammad ibn Anushtakīn died, after he had returned ill from fighting the Qarakhitay. He was succeeded by his son Sultān Shāh Maḥmūd, whose mother administered the realm and the army.

His older son 'Alā' al-Dīn Tekesh was dwelling in Jand, which had been given him as a fief by his father. When he heard of his father's death and the appointment of his young brother, he refused to accept it and went to the ruler of the Khitay whom he asked for aid against his brother and tempted with the wealth and treasure of Khwārazm. The ruler sent with him a large army, commanded by Fūmā.¹ They proceeded until they drew near Khwārazm.

Sultān Shāh along with his mother left to go to al-Mu'ayyad, to whom he gave a very costly gift and promised *him* the wealth and treasure of Khwārazm. Deluded by his words, he gathered his troops and marched with Sultān Shāh until he reached Sūbarnī,² a little town twenty leagues from Khwārazm [Urgench]. Tekesh had made camp nearby and now advanced towards them. When the two armies set eyes on one another, al-Mu'ayyad's force fled. Al-Mu'ayyad himself, wounded and taken prisoner, was brought to Khwārazm Shāh Tekesh, who ordered his death. He was killed in cold blood before him.

[378] Sultān Shāh escaped and was taken to Dihistan. Tekesh followed him and overwhelmed the city by assault. Sultān Shāh escaped again but his mother was taken by Tekesh and killed. He then returned to Khwārazm. When the defeated members of al-Mu'ayyad's army returned to Nishapur, they put into power his son, Tughān Shāh Abū Bakr ibn al-Mu'ayyad. Sultān Shāh joined him but later moved from there to Ghiyāth al-Dīn, the ruler of the Ghurids, who received him with honour and respect and made him very welcome.

As for 'Alā' al-Dīn Tekesh, after he became well established in Khwārazm, he was contacted by envoys of the Khitay bringing high-handed proposals, as was their custom, and he was carried away by zeal for his position and his religion and killed one of the ruler's relatives, who had come to him with a group sent by their

¹ The text has Qūmā. The daughter of the first Gūr-Khān had taken a husband, known as Fūmā, which in Chinese means 'son-in-law of the king' (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 337 and note 3; Bosworth, 'The Iranian world', 189).

² Yāqūt, iii, 182, gives the name thus, but various spellings are found. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 337 and note 5 has: Sūbarlī (?).

ruler to demand money from Khwārazm Shāh. The latter ordered each of the notables of Khwārazm to kill one of the Khitay and not one of them survived. They rejected the Khitay ruler's alliance.

This came to the ears of Sultān Shāh, who went to the ruler of the Khitay and, taking advantage of this situation, asked him for aid against his brother 'Alā' al-Dīn Tekesh. He claimed that the people of Khwārazm were with him, favouring him and preferring him to be their ruler. Were they to see him, they would surrender the city to him. The ruler therefore sent a large army with him, again led by Fūmā. They reached Khwārazm and besieged it. 'Alā' al-Dīn ordered the waters of the Oxus to be diverted to impede them and they almost drowned. They moved away without having gained any objective and were overtaken by regret when regret was useless. They blamed and rebuked Sultān Shāh, who said to Fūmā, 'If you were to send an army with me to Marv, I would free it from the hands of Dīnār of the Oghuz.' He had ruled it since the time of the Oghuz troubles until this present time. So he sent an army with him, which descended upon Sarakhs, taking the inhabitants unaware. They attacked the Oghuz and did great slaughter among them, not leaving one of them there. Dīnār, their ruler, threw himself into the citadel's moat. He was lifted out [379] and entered the citadel, where he took refuge.

Sultān Shāh moved on to Marv and took it. The Khitay returned to Transoxania and Sultān Shāh made it his custom to fight and harass the Oghuz, killing and plundering them. When Dīnār became incapable of standing against him, he sent to Nishapur, to Tughān Shāh, son of al-Mu'ayyad, saying to him that he should send someone to him to whom he could hand over the citadel of Sarakhs. He therefore sent an army with an emir, named Qarāqūsh, to whom Dīnār handed the citadel and then joined Tughān Shāh.

Sultān Shāh marched to Sarakhs and besieged its citadel. Tughān Shāh, hearing of this, assembled his troops and marched to Sarakhs. When he and Sultān Shāh met, Tughān Shāh fled to Nishapur. This was in the year 576 [1180–81]. Qarāqūsh vacated the citadel of Sarakhs and joined his master, so Sultān Shāh took it and later also Tūs and al-Zāmm.³ He made things very difficult for Tughān Shāh with his lofty aspiration, his restlessness and his eagerness to seek power. Tughān Shāh, however, loved the easy life and was addicted to wine. This continued to be the state of affairs until the death of Tughān Shāh in Muḥarram of the year 582 [24 March–22 April 1186]. His son Sanjar Shāh succeeded but was dominated by a mamluke of his grandfather al-Mu'ayyad, whose name was Manklī Takīn. The emirs slipped away, outraged at his arbitrary control, and most of them attached themselves to Sultān Shāh. Dīnār went to Kerman, accompanied by the Oghuz, and took control there.

Manklī Takīn, however, ruled badly over his subjects, seized their money and

³ Zamm on the left bank of the Oxus is the site of the modern Kerki (Barthold, *Turkestan*, 80).

killed some emirs. Hearing of this, Khwārazm Shāh marched against him and besieged Nishapur in Rabī' I 582 [22 May–20 June 1186]. He besieged it for two months without success and returned to Khwārazm. He returned to besiege it again in the year 583 [1187–88]. They asked him for terms, which he granted, and they surrendered the city to him. He killed Manklī Takīn and seized [380] Sanjar Shāh, whom he honoured and settled in Khwārazm, where he treated him well. Sanjar Shāh sent to Nishapur to win over the inhabitants so that he could return there. Khwārazm Shāh heard of this and seized and blinded Sanjar Shāh. He had married his mother and given his daughter to him in marriage. His daughter died, so he married him to his sister. Sanjar Shāh remained with him until he died in the year 595 [1198–99].

Such was the account of Abū'l-Ḥasan ibn Abī'l-Qāsim al-Bayhaqī in his work *Mashārib al-Tajārib*.⁴ Another historian recounted these events differently in some matters, dating them earlier or later. We shall give this account here.

Tekesh, [the son of] Khwārazm Shāh Īl Arslān, ousted his brother Sultān Shāh from Khwārazm, of which he had become ruler after the death of his father, so he came to Marv, which he took and drove out the Oghuz. They left for some days, then returned and expelled him and sacked his treasury, killing most of his men. He crossed to the Khitay, asked for their aid and guaranteed them money. He then arrived with a large army and ousted the Oghuz from Marv, Sarakhs, Nasā, Abīward, all which he seized and then sent back the Khitay.

When they were far removed, he wrote to Ghiyāth al-Dīn al-Ghūrī demanding that he give up Herat, Būshanj, Bādghīs and neighbouring lands and threatening him if he did not do so. Ghiyāth al-Dīn responded with demands that he establish the khutbah in his name at Marv, Sarakhs and the Khurasan lands that he had conquered. Having heard this message, Sultān Shāh left Marv and carried out raids on Bādghīs, Baywār and nearby areas. He besieged Būshanj, ravaged the villages and extorted money from the peasants. When Ghiyāth al-Dīn heard of this, he did not think it right for himself to go in person but he sent the ruler of Sijistan and wrote to his nephew, Bahā' al-Dīn Sām, the lord of Bāmiyān, that he should join him, because his brother Shihāb al-Dīn was in India and it was wintertime. Bahā' al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn's nephew, and the ruler of Sijistan, along with the troops of both of them, came and their arrival at Herat coincided with that of Sultān Shāh. When the latter heard of their arrival, he returned to Marv without making any assault on the town, and burnt and plundered every area he passed through. He remained at Marv until the spring. He renewed his previous approaches to Ghiyāth al-Dīn [381] who sent to his brother Shihāb al-Dīn to inform him of the situation.

⁴ This work, lost except for scattered quotations and perhaps translatable as *Fountains of Experiences*, by Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Zayd (known as Ibn Funduq) probably had a continuation that was used by Ibn al-Athīr, because Ibn Funduq died in 565/1169 (see Cahen, 'Historiography', 64–66; *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 145; *EI*(2), i, 1131–2).

Immediately Shihāb al-Dīn proclaimed that his troops should depart and he returned to Khurasan, where he, his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn and the ruler of Sijistan and other troops met together and marched against Sultān Shāh. Having become aware of this, he too gathered his forces, Oghuz tribesmen, trouble-makers, brigands and eager opportunists, in very large numbers. Ghiyāth al-Dīn and his followers camped at Tāliqān, whereas Sultān Shāh did so at Marv al-Rūdh. The Ghurid army advanced towards him and both sides promised a pitched battle.

Thus they remained for two months, while envoys went to and fro between Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Sultān Shāh and while Shihāb al-Dīn was demanding from his brother leave to start the battle which he would not allow. The settlement reached was that Ghiyāth al-Dīn should give over to Sultān Shāh Būshanj, Bādghīs and the fortresses of Baywār. Shihāb al-Dīn and Bahā' al-Dīn, lord of Bāmiyān, disapproved of this, yet could not disobey Ghiyāth al-Dīn. In the end Sultān Shāh's envoy came before Ghiyāth al-Dīn in the presence of the emirs to write the treaty. The envoy said, 'Sultān Shāh asks that Shihāb al-Dīn and Bahā' al-Dīn should attend this business.' Ghiyāth al-Dīn sent for them but they replied, 'We are your mamlukes. Whatever you do, we cannot go against you.'

While the people were gathered to draw up the treaty, Majd al-Dīn al-'Alawī al-Harawī appeared. He was close to Ghiyāth al-Dīn, so much so that he could do whatever he chose in his realm and not be denied. Al-'Alawī arrived, hand in hand with Alp Ghāzī, nephew of Ghiyāth al-Dīn, after the document had been written and after Ghiyāth al-Dīn had summoned his brother Shihāb al-Dīn and Bahā' al-Dīn Sām, lord of Bāmiyān. Al-'Alawī came forward as though he was going to speak privately with Ghiyāth al-Dīn, stood in the centre of the circle and said to the envoy, 'You there! say to Sultān Shāh, "You have achieved a peace as regards the great sultan, Shihāb al-Dīn and Bahā' al-Dīn but your enemy al-'Alawī says that the sword divides him and the lord Alp Ghāzī from you.'" He then gave a great shout, tore his garments and heaped dust on his head. He turned to Ghiyāth al-Dīn and said, 'Here is one [Sultān Shāh] whom his own brother has rejected and cast out [382] alone and isolated. Why do you leave him what we have conquered with our swords from the Oghuz and the Turks of Sanjar? When he hears this about us, his brother will come seeking to challenge for India and all you possess.' Ghiyāth al-Dīn shook his head but did not utter a word. The ruler of Sijistan said to al-'Alawī, 'Leave the matter to be settled.'

When Ghiyāth al-Dīn did not speak to al-'Alawī, Shihāb al-Dīn said to his heralds, 'Announce among the troops that they should prepare for battle and for an advance to Marv al-Rūdh', and he rose to go. Al-'Alawī recited a verse of poetry in Persian, the sense of it being 'Death beneath the swords is easier than acceptance of humiliation'. The envoy returned to Sultān Shāh and informed him of the circumstances, so he drew up his troops for battle. Both sides met in a fierce battle and endured the conflict. Eventually Sultān Shāh and his army were defeated and most of his men were taken prisoner, but Ghiyāth al-Dīn set them free. Sultān Shāh entered Marv with twenty horsemen and was later joined by about 1,500 cavalry.

When Khwārazm Shāh Tekesh heard what had happened to his brother, he set out from Khwārazm with 2,000 horse and sent 3,000 horse to the Oxus to cut off his brother's route if he wished to go to the Khitay. He made forced marches to arrest his brother before he regained strength. News of this reached Sultān Shāh but he was unable to cross the Oxus to the Khitay, so he set out to Ghiyāth al-Dīn and wrote to him telling him that he was coming. Ghiyāth al-Dīn wrote to Herat and his other lands that he should be treated with honour and respect and provided with all necessities. This was done and he came to Ghiyāth al-Dīn who welcomed him with honour and lodged him with himself in his palace. He lodged Sultān Shāh's men, each one of them with a man of similar rank, the vizier with his vizier, the army inspector⁵ with his inspector and similarly with others. He stayed with him until the end of winter, when 'Alā' al-Dīn [Tekesh] sent to Ghiyāth al-Dīn reminding him of how his brother Sultān Shāh had destroyed his lands and raised troops against him and advising his arrest and return to himself. He received the envoy and just at that time there came to him a letter from his lieutenant [383] in Herat, informing him that he had received Khwārazm Shāh's letter, threatening him. Ghiyāth al-Dīn replied that he should not reveal to Khwārazm Shāh that he had told him of the situation. He summoned the envoy and said, 'Say to 'Alā' al-Dīn, "You claim that Sultān Shāh has ruined the land and sought your kingdom. By my life, he is a prince and the son of a prince and has high aspirations. If he seeks kingship, then he does what others like him have done. There is One who disposes affairs and links them with whoever deserves them. He has taken refuge with me and you should withdraw from his land and give him a share of what his father left and a share of the properties he left and the money. He made you both swear to be sincere friends. Make the khutbah for me in Khwārazm and marry my brother Shihāb al-Dīn to your sister."'

When Khwārazm Shāh heard this communication, he was furious and wrote a letter to Ghiyāth al-Dīn, threatening to invade his lands. Ghiyāth al-Dīn prepared troops with his nephew Alp Ghāzī and the ruler of Sijistan and sent them with Sultān Shāh to Khwārazm. He wrote too to al-Mu'ayyad, lord of Nishapur, asking him for support. They had become related by marriage ties, as al-Mu'ayyad had married his son Ṭughān Shāh to the daughter of Ghiyāth al-Dīn. Al-Mu'ayyad assembled his troops and waited outside Nishapur on the Khwārazm road.

Khwārazm Shāh had set out from Khwārazm to confront the Ghurid army that was with his brother Sultān Shāh and had camped on the edge of the sands. While he was on the way, news of al-Mu'ayyad came to him, that he had gathered troops and was intending to invade Khwārazm after his departure. He took his money and his stores and crossed the Oxus to the Khitay and abandoned Khwārazm. Great disorder broke out there and several of the local notables attended upon Alp Ghāzī and requested him to send an emir with them who could restore order. He feared that this was a ruse and refused.

⁵ The 'ārid, head of the *dīwān al-'ard* (see Lambton, *Continuity and Change*, 37-9).

[384] During this situation Sultān Shāh died, on the last day of Ramaḍān 589 [29 September 1193]. Alp Ghāzī wrote with this news to Ghiyāth al-Dīn and he had a reply, ordering him to return. He did so, accompanied by Sultān Shāh's men, whom Ghiyāth al-Dīn ordered to be taken into service and assigned excellent fiefs. All of them requited his kindness with ingratitude. We shall relate the rest of their history.

Having heard of the death of his brother, Khwārazm Shāh Tekesh returned to Khwārazm and sent prefects to Sarakhs and Marv. The emir of Herat, 'Umar ibn Marghanī,⁶ sent a force against them and expelled them, saying, 'Until we ask leave of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn.' Khwārazm Shāh sent an envoy to Ghiyāth al-Dīn, asking for peace and a marriage alliance. With his envoy he sent a group of lawyers of Khurasan and Alids, and along with them Wajīh al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd, the person who made Ghiyāth al-Dīn a Shāfi'i and was highly regarded by him. They preached a homily before him and urged him to fear God Almighty. They told him that Khwārazm Shāh was in contact with them and threatening them that he would come with the Turks and the Khitay and allow them a free hand over their womenfolk and their property. They said to him, 'Either you come in person and make Marv your capital to thwart the ambitions of the infidels and give security to the inhabitants or you make peace with Khwārazm Shāh.' He agreed to make peace and to give up interfering in his lands.

When the Oghuz in Khurasan heard this, they had eyes on the country and took to plunder, burning and destruction again. Khwārazm Shāh learnt of this, assembled troops and came to Khurasan. He entered Marv, Sarakhs, Nasā, Abīward and elsewhere. He restored order and made a move against Tūs, which was held by al-Mu'ayyad, lord of Nishapur. The latter raised his troops and marched towards him. Hearing of his march, Khwārazm Shāh returned to Khwārazm. When he came to the sands, he remained on the fringes. Al-Mu'ayyad, hearing of his return to Khwārazm, had designs on him and pursued him. When this came [385] by Khwārazm Shāh's hearing, he sent to the watering-places in the steppe and threw dead animals and soil into them, so that they were impossible to use.

When al-Mu'ayyad came to the middle of the steppe, he looked for water but found none. Khwārazm Shāh came to him, when he was in that state, bringing water on camels. Surrounded, al-Mu'ayyad and his army surrendered, every last man. He was brought as a captive to Khwārazm Shāh, who ordered his head to be cut off. He said, 'You catamite! Is this how [important] people are treated?' but he took no notice of him. He put him to death and took his head to Khwārazm.

After the ruler of Nishapur was killed his son Ṭughān Shāh took over what he had held. The following year Khwārazm Shāh assembled his forces and marched to Nishapur, which he besieged and attacked. When Ṭughān Shāh resisted, he

⁶ 'Umar ibn Muḥammad al-Marghanī was Ghiyāth al-Dīn's deputy in Herat (*Kāmil*, xii, 164).

withdrew but later returned. Tughān Shāh sallied forth to confront him but Khwārazm Shāh took him prisoner, married him to his sister and took him with him to Khwārazm. He was now ruler of Nishapur and all that Tughān Shāh had ruled, a man of great consequence and power.

What has been related in this version differs from the account that preceded it. If it had been possible to reconcile the two versions I would have done so. However, one has placed earlier what the other has put later. Therefore we have given in full what both report. Because the area is remote from us we have not learnt which of the two versions is the more correct to enable us to report that one and ignore the other. In addition we have given this material in one place because the rule of Sultān Shāh did not last long enough, either for him or for his successors, to be divided under various years, and therefore we have given it in a continuous narrative.⁷

Account of the Franks' raid on the district of Hawrān and the Muslim raid on Frankish territory

In Rabī‘ I of this year [21 October-19 November 1172] the Franks gathered and marched into the district of Hawrān in the province of Damascus to raid it. The news came to Nūr al-Dīn, when he had already moved out and camped, he [386] and his standing army, at Kiswa. In forced marches he advanced on them with his troops. Learning of his approach, the Franks entered the Sawād, also part of the Damascus province. The Muslims caught them up, seized men from their rear-guard and inflicted losses on them. Nūr al-Dīn moved to a position at ‘Ashtarā, from where he sent a squadron into the Tiberias area, and they carried out raids, plundering, seizing captives, burning and destroying. When they heard that, the Franks set out towards them to defend their lands. When they arrived, the Muslims had finished their ravaging and booty taking and had retired across the river.

The Franks caught up with them and the brave champions of the Muslims halted opposite them to give battle. The fighting was fierce and both sides held firm, the Franks hoping to reach and retrieve the booty and the Muslims wishing to hold them back, so that those who were travelling with the booty could escape with it. After the battle had lasted a long time and the booty was far away and safe with the Muslims, the Franks withdrew, having been unable to recover any of it.

Account of Shams al-Dawla's expedition to Nubia

In Jumādā I this year [19 December 1172-18 January 1173] Shams al-Dawla

⁷ A survey of the eastern Saljuq sultanate and the Khwārazm Shāhs and their relations with the Qarakhanids and the Qarakhitay will be found in Sevim and Bosworth, 'The Seljuqs and the Khwarazm Shahs', 161-72.

Tūrānshāh ibn Ayyūb, Saladin's older brother, left Egypt for Nubia. He came to the first parts of their country to conquer and take control. The reason for this was that Saladin and his family knew that Nūr al-Dīn was intending to invade Egypt and take it from them, so their agreed plan was that they would seize power either in Nubia or Yemen, so that, if Nūr al-Dīn came against them, they would confront and resist him [387] and, if they were strong enough to stop him, they would remain in Egypt, but if they were incapable of stopping him, they would take ship and repair to the lands they had conquered.

Shams al-Dīn made his preparations and set out for Aswan and from there for the Nubian lands. He besieged a castle called Ibrīm. The inhabitants fought him but they did not have the strength to fight a Muslim army, because they had no protection to defend them from arrows and other weapons. They surrendered Ibrīm to Shams al-Dīn's control and he made it his residence. However, he saw no source of income from the land that was desirable and for which it was worth bearing the hardships. The [basic] food of the people was millet. When he saw the lack of profit and the ruggedness of life there, in addition to the constant warfare and putting up with fatigue and hardship, he gave up the country and returned to Egypt with the booty he had taken. Most of the booty was male and female slaves.

Account of the victory of Mleh, son of Leon, over the Byzantines

In Jumādā I [19 December 1172–18 January 1173] Mleh son of Leon, the Armenian, lord of the Passes in the neighbourhood of Aleppo, defeated a Byzantine army from Constantinople. This came about because Nūr al-Dīn had taken Mleh into his service and assigned him a splendid fief. He was assiduous in his service to Nūr al-Dīn and was present at his battles with the Franks and took direct part in them. He was a man of excellent and sound judgment. When people had words with Nūr al-Dīn about the idea of taking him into service and giving him a fief from the lands of Islam, he said, 'I use him to help fight against his own co-religionists and I can rest a group of my army, which then faces him, ready to stop him raiding his neighbouring lands.'

Mleh was also strengthened by Nūr al-Dīn against the Armenians and Byzantines who were his neighbours. [388] Adana, Massisa and Tarsus were in the hands of the Byzantine ruler, the emperor of Constantinople. Mleh took them, because they were next to his lands, and the emperor sent a large army against him, the command of which he gave to a leading patrician, one of his relatives. Mleh, with a detachment from Nūr al-Dīn's army, met them in battle and fought well and stubbornly. The Greeks were defeated and many of them were killed or taken prisoner. Mleh grew strong and powerful and the Greeks despaired of recovering those lands.

Mleh sent Nūr al-Dīn much of the booty and thirty of the prisoners, who were among their eminent and notable men. Nūr al-Dīn sent part of this to the Caliph

al-Mustadī' bi-Amr Allāh and wrote a letter, claiming the credit for this victory because some of his troops had effected it.

Account of the death of Īldikiz

This year the Atabeg Īldikiz died in Isfahan. He was succeeded by his son Muḥammad Pahlawān with no dispute. Īldikiz was a mamluke of Kamāl al-Dīn al-Sumayramī, the vizier of Sultan Maḥmūd. When Kamāl al-Dīn was killed, as we have related, Īldikiz passed to Sultan Maḥmūd. When Sultan Maṣūd succeeded, he appointed him to Arrāniyya. After he had gone there, he never again appeared before Sultan Maṣūd or any other [sultan]. He came to rule most of Azerbayjan, the Uplands, Hamadhan and other parts, Isfahan, Rayy and the lands near the last two. He made the khutbah for his stepson, Arslān Shāh ibn Ṭughril. His standing army numbered fifty [389] thousand cavalry, not counting auxiliary forces and his realm stretched from the gates of Tiflis to Kerman. Alongside him Sultan Arslān Shāh had no power, but was simply the recipient of a regular pension.

His domination over him was such that Arslān Shāh got drunk one night and gave away what was in his treasury, which was a lot. When he heard of this, Īldikiz demanded it all back from him and said, ‘When you dispense money on the wrong object, you are also taking it without justification and you wrong the people.’ Īldikiz was a wise man and a good ruler, who held sessions in person for the people, to hear their complaints and deliver justice among them.

How the Turks came to Ifrīqiya and took Tripoli and other places

This year a body of Turks went from Egypt with Qarāqūsh, the mamluke of Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar, Saladin’s nephew, to the mountains of Nafūsa. He was joined by Maṣūd ibn Zimām, known as Maṣūd the Axeman,⁸ one of the leading Bedouin emirs there, who was in rebellion against ‘Abd al-Mu’min and his sons. They came to an agreement and their following became numerous. They descended upon western Tripoli and put it under a close siege. It fell and Qarāqūsh took control there and settled his family in the palace. He took much of the land of Ifrīqiya, except for Mahdiyya, Sfax, Gafsa, Tunis and the villages and settlements near them.

Qarāqūsh came to have a large army and he ruled over these lands with the assistance of the Bedouin and with his natural bent for destruction and plunder and disruption by cutting down trees, fruit and such like. He collected vast sums of money and kept them in the city of Gabès. His ambition grew and he dreamt of seizing the whole of Ifrīqiya, because its ruler Abū Ya‘qūb ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’min was far away. We shall relate what came to pass, God willing.

⁸ Arabic al-Ballāṭ, from *balt* or *balṭa*, ‘battle-axe’.

[390] Account of Ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s attack on the Franks in Andalusia

In this year Abū Ya’qūb Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’min mobilized his troops and set out from Seville on a raid. He invaded Frankish territory and descended upon Ronda, which is near Toledo to the east of it, and besieged the city. The Franks in great numbers gathered to help the son of Alfonso, the king of Toledo,⁹ but did not advance to confront the Muslims.

It happened that famine and high prices became very serious for the Muslims and they lacked provisions, for they were a great host. They were obliged to leave Frankish territory and return to Seville. Abū Ya’qūb remained there until the year 571 [1175–6], while in the meantime equipping armies and sending them out continuously to raid Frankish lands. There were several battles and engagements in which the Arabs manifested indescribable bravery. A champion among the Arabs would march forth between the battle-lines and challenge a champion on the Frankish side, but no-one would accept the challenge. Eventually Abū Ya’qūb returned to Marrakech.

Account of the sack of Nihāwand

During this year Shumla’s troops sacked Nihāwand. This came about because throughout the rule of Īldikiz Shumla continued to ask him for Nihāwand as it was contiguous with his land. He offered money for it but it was not granted to him. When Īldikiz died and was succeeded by his son Muḥammad Pahlawān, who went to Azerbaijan to settle matters there, Shumla sent his nephew Ibn Sankā to seize Nihāwand. [391] The inhabitants heard of this and fortified themselves in the city. They resisted his attacks during his siege and taunted him with foul language. When he realized that he was not powerful enough to defeat them, he retired to Tustar, which was close by. The people of Nihāwand sent to Pahlawān, seeking assistance from him, but it was slow in coming. When the inhabitants now felt confident, Ibn Sankā left Tustar with 500 horse without heavy baggage, travelled for a day and a night, covered forty leagues and arrived at Nihāwand. He gave a trumpet call and pretended that he was one of Pahlawān’s men, because they came from the right direction. The inhabitants opened the gates and he entered. Having arrived in the centre, he arrested the cadi and the headmen and crucified them, sacked and burnt the city, cut off the nose of the governor, whom he then released, and departed in the direction of Māsabdhān,¹⁰ making for Iraq.

⁹ i.e. Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158–1214).

¹⁰ A district in the Uplands, whose main town is Shīrvān (Yāqūt, iv, 393; Krawulsky, 365, 367).

How Nūr al-Dīn invaded the lands of Qilij Arslān

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī set out for the realm of ‘Izz al-Dīn Qilij Arslān ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, namely Malatya, Sivas, Aqsaray and elsewhere, intending to make war on him and take his lands from him. This came about because Dhū'l-Nūn ibn Dānishmand, lord of Malatya and Sivas, was attacked by Qilij Arslān, who took his lands and expelled him as a lone outcast. Dhū'l-Nūn went as a suppliant to Nūr al-Dīn, seeking refuge with him. He received him with honour and kindness and provided for him all that was fit for princes and promised him aid and efforts to restore his kingdom to him.

He sent to Qilij Arslān, interceding with him for the restoration of the lands of Dhū'l-Nūn, but this he refused. Therefore Nūr al-Dīn marched against him, beginning with Kaysūn, Bahasnā, Mar‘ash and Marzubān, which he seized with all they contained. He took Mar‘ash in the early days of Dhū'l-Qa‘da [began 14 June 1173]¹¹ and the rest later than that. Having taken them, he sent a detachment of his army to conquer Sivas, which they did.

[392] When Nūr al-Dīn marched into his territory, Qilij Arslān moved from the outlying parts which were close to Syria, into the centre and wrote to Nūr al-Dīn to conciliate him and ask him for peace. Nūr al-Dīn put off his attack, in the hope that matters could be settled without hostilities. Unsettling news concerning the Franks had also reached him, so he agreed to make peace. However, he stipulated that Qilij Arslān should aid him with troops to wage Jihad. He said to him, ‘You are a neighbour of the Byzantines but you do not raid them. Your lands are a large part of the lands of Islam. You must wage Jihad with me.’ He agreed to that and that Sivas should remain as it was in the hands of Nūr al-Dīn’s lieutenants, while belonging to Dhū'l-Nūn. Troops stayed there at the service of Dhū'l-Nūn until Nūr al-Dīn died. After his death his troops left and Qilij Arslān returned and recovered it. It remains in his children’s hands until the present, the year 620 [1223].

While Nūr al-Dīn was on this expedition, his envoy Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Shahrazūrī came to him from Baghdad, bringing with him a diploma from the caliph, granting him Mosul, the Jazīra, Irbil, Khilāṭ, Syria, the lands of Qilij Arslān and Egypt.¹²

Saladin’s expedition from Egypt against Kerak and his withdrawal

In Shawwāl of this year [May–June 1173]¹³ Saladin set out from Egypt with all his forces to the lands of the Franks, meaning to besiege Kerak and to join with Nūr

¹¹ According to ‘Imād al-Dīn, Mar‘ash fell on 20 Dhū'l-Qa‘da/3 July 1173 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 260).

¹² For the mission to Baghdad, see below p. [395].

¹³ ‘Imād al-Dīn is quoted as giving the date 15 Shawwāl/30 May 1173 in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 238, but 15 Sha‘bān/1 April 1173 in *Sanā al-barq*, 65.

al-Dīn in attacking it. They agreed to attack Frankish territory from two directions, each one leading his troops from one of them. This resulted from the fact that Nūr al-Dīn blamed Saladin for his withdrawal from Frankish territory [393] during the previous year. Nūr al-Dīn wanted to attack Egypt and take it from him, but Saladin sent his excuses with promises that he would take action on the basis of whatever Nūr al-Dīn would decide. It was settled between them that Saladin would move from Egypt and Nūr al-Dīn from Damascus and that whoever came first would wait until the other arrived. They fixed a definite day for their rendezvous and Saladin left Egypt because his route was more difficult, longer and more fatiguing. He came to Kerak and put it under siege.

Nūr al-Dīn, however, after he had received Saladin's letter announcing his departure from Egypt, distributed money, procured provisions and what else he needed and set out for Kerak. He reached al-Raqīm, which is two days' journey from Kerak, and when Saladin heard that he was close by, he and all his family were fearful of Nūr al-Dīn and they all agreed on a return to Egypt. He gave up his rendezvous with Nūr al-Dīn, because they all realized that, if the two met, it would be easy for Nūr al-Dīn to dismiss him.¹⁴

After his return he sent the lawyer 'Isā to Nūr al-Dīn to make his excuses for his departure, on the grounds that he had left his father Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb as his deputy in Egypt and that he was now severely ill, feared to be on the point of death, with the chance that they might lose the country. Along with him he sent rare gifts that beggar description. The envoy came to Nūr al-Dīn and gave that message. Nūr al-Dīn was outraged and understood what was behind his return, although he did not show any reaction to the envoy, but said to him, 'To preserve Egypt is more important in our eyes than anything else.'

Saladin returned to Egypt and found his father already deceased and gone to meet his Lord. Many a word says to him who utters it, 'Leave me [unsaid]'. The cause of Najm al-Dīn's death was that he went riding one day in Old Cairo and his horse bolted very wildly. He fell off and was carried to his residence fatally injured. He lingered for a few days and died on 27 Dhū'l-Hijja¹⁵ [=7 August 1173]. He was a good and wise man, [394] of excellent conduct, generous, very kind to poor scholars and sufis and a frequenter of their gatherings. What we have said about him, about the beginning of his career and that of his brother Shīrkūh need not be repeated here.

Miscellaneous events

The Tigris rose greatly this year and in Sha'bān [18 March–15 April 1173]

¹⁴ This version of events cannot be accepted as, during the summer of 1173, Nūr al-Dīn was campaigning in the north against Qilij Arslān.

¹⁵ 'Tuesday' is specified in *Rawdatayn*, ii, 248.

Baghdad was on the point of being inundated, so they blocked the gates of the quarters. The water reached the domed mausoleum of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, the Niẓāmiyya and the Hospice of the Chief Shaykh. The inhabitants busied themselves with work on the Qūrij Canal but then the water subsided and people were spared the disaster.

This year there was a fire at Baghdad, from the Bahrūz Quarter as far as the gate of the Palace Mosque and in the other direction from the Copper Stone¹⁶ as far as the caliph's mother's residence.

Also this year the Banū Ḥazn, part of the Khafaja, raided the Sawād of Iraq. This came about because they held the 'protectorate' over that area and when Yazdan became powerful in the land and took over Ḥilla, he took it from them and gave it to the Banū Ka'b, also of Khafaja. The Banū Ḥazn therefore raided the area. Yazdan set out with an army, accompanied by al-Ghaḍbān al-Khafajī, one of the Banū Ka'b, to fight the Banū Ḥazn. While they were on the march one night a soldier shot al-Ghaḍbān with an arrow and killed him because of his wickedness while he was in the Sawād. After he was killed the army returned to Baghdad and the 'protectorate' of the Sawād was restored to the Banū Ḥazn.

During this year, while Īldikiz was still alive, Barjam al-Īwā'ī appeared with a band of Turkomans and attacked the districts of Hamadhan. He sacked Dīnawar and allowed the violation of the womenfolk. [395] Īldikiz heard of this while he was in Nakhchevan and, making forced marches with the lightly-equipped men of his army, he pursued Barjam, who fled until he came near to Baghdad. Īldikiz followed him but the caliph thought that it was a ruse to make a surprise move against Baghdad, so he began to assemble troops and repair the walls. He sent Īldikiz robes of honour and fulsome titles. The latter explained that his only intention had been to restrain the wicked actions of these people. He did not cross over the barrage at Khāniqīn but returned home.

This year Emir Yazdan, one of the most important emirs of Baghdad, died. He had Shiīte sympathies and over him there was an outbreak of discord between the Sunnis and the Shiītes in Wāsiṭ, because the Shiītes held a session of condolence for him but the Sunnis made their delight at his demise obvious. The situation ended in a battle and several on both sides were killed. After Yazdan's death his brother Tunāmish was assigned all that he had held, namely the town of Wāsiṭ, and he was given the honorific title 'Alā' al-Dīn.

This year Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī sent an envoy to the caliph. The envoy was the Cadi Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Shahrazūrī, the cadi of all his lands and the head of the charitable endowments and the administration. He gave him a missive to carry, which contained his duty to the caliph and an account of his efforts in the Jihad against the infidels and of his conquests and a request for a diploma for the lands he held, Egypt, Syria, and the Jazīra with Mosul and those subject to him, such as Diyār Bakr, and the adjacent

¹⁶ Arabic *ḥajar al-nuḥās*. Unidentified.

lands, such as Khilāṭ, and those of Qilij Arslān, and a request to be given the fiefs in the Sawād of Iraq that his father Zankī had held, namely Ṣarīfīn and Darb Hārūn.¹⁷ He also asked for a plot of land on the bank of the Tigris to build a madrasah for the Shāfi‘īs, which he would endow with Ṣarīfīn and Darb Hārūn. Kamāl al-Dīn was received with honour such as no previous envoy had known and all his requests were granted. Nūr al-Dīn died before work started on the building of the madrasah (God have mercy upon him).

¹⁷ For this grant, see *Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), 330, s.a. 530.

How Shams al-Dawla conquered Zabīd, Aden and other places in Yemen

We have already mentioned that Saladin, lord of Egypt, and his family were fearful that Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd might enter Egypt and take it from them. They therefore embarked on finding a realm that they could invade and conquer to have as an asylum. If Nūr al-Dīn drove them out of Egypt, they could go and reside there. They sent Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh ibn Ayyūb, Saladin's older brother, to Nubia, as we have related.

When he returned to Egypt, they asked Nūr al-Dīn for permission for him to go to Yemen to attack ‘Abd al-Nabī, ruler of Zabīd, and seize his lands because the Abbasid khutbah had been suppressed. He gave this permission.¹

There was in Egypt a poet called ‘Umāra, who was from Yemen.² He encouraged Shams al-Dawla to invade Yemen with descriptions of the country which increased its importance in his eyes. His words greatly added to his eagerness. He started to make his preparations and make ready provisions, water-skins, weapons and other equipment. He raised troops in large numbers and started from Egypt on 1 Rajab [5 February 1174]. He passed through Mecca (may God glorify it) and went on to Zabīd, where the ruler who held the place was called ‘Abd al-Nabī. When he drew near³ and was seen by the inhabitants, they considered his following to be few in number. ‘Abd al-Nabī said to them, 'I can just see you meeting these men, already overcome by the heat and half-dead. They are a mere head-sore!' He went out [397] to face them with his troops, but when Shams al-Dawla and his men engaged them, the men of Zabīd gave way and fled.

When the Egyptians reached the town wall, they found no defenders on it, so they raised their ladders and climbed up. They took the town by force and sacked it thoroughly. They made ‘Abd al-Nabī their prisoner and also his wife, called al-Hurra (the Freewoman), who was a pious woman and very charitable, especially when on the Pilgrimage. Poor pilgrims met with abundant alms, much good and great kindness from her. Shams al-Dawla handed over ‘Abd al-Nabī to one of his emirs, called Sayf al-Dawla Mubārak ibn Kāmil, one of the Banū Munqidh, the lords of Shayzar, and ordered him to extract money from him, of

¹ The reasons for the Yemeni expedition are discussed at length in Smith, *Ayyubids and Early Rasulids*, 31–49.

² For ‘Umāra al-Yamanī (515–69/1121–74) see *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, ii, 792–3.

³ According to Ibn Abī Ṭayy, he arrived at Zabīd early in Shawwāl/began 5 May 1174 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 274).

which he gave Sayf al-Dawla a great deal. Later he told them of the whereabouts of a tomb he had made for his father and erected a large building over it. He had many buried treasures there which he told them of. The money was extracted and was a significant amount. As for al-Ḥurra, she also indicated where she had deposits and large sums were taken from her.

Having taken Zabīd and established their control there over a subdued population, the khutbah for the Abbasids was instituted and local administration put in order. They then proceeded to Aden on the coast. It had a large anchorage and was the port for India, the Zanj, Abyssinia, Oman, Kerman, Kish, Fars and elsewhere. From the landward side it was one of the most highly defended of cities. Its ruler was a man called Yāsir. Had he remained within and not marched out, they would have retired unsuccessful. It was just his ignorance and the [ordained] end of his time that led him to make a sally and engage them in battle. When battle was joined, Yāsir and his men fled but some of Shams al-Dawla's army outstripped them and, entering the city before them, seized it and took its ruler Yāsir prisoner. They wished to sack the town but Shams al-Dawla stopped them and said, 'We have not come to destroy the country. Rather we have come to rule, [398] develop it and benefit from its revenue.' Nobody plundered anything and it stayed untouched. Shams al-Dawla's rule became firmly established.

When he came to Aden, 'Abd al-Nabī was with him as a prisoner. On his entry into Aden, he said, 'Glory be to God! I had always known that I would enter Aden in great state. I was expecting it and happy about it, but I did not know that I would enter in these circumstances.'⁴

After finishing his business at Aden, Shams al-Dawla returned to Zabīd and besieged the fortresses in the mountains. He took Ta'izz, one of the strongest castles, where the treasures of the ruler of Zabīd were. He also took the castle of al-Ta'kur⁵ and Janad, as well as other castles and fortresses. He left as his lieutenant in Aden 'Izz al-Dīn 'Uthmān ibn al-Zanjīlī and in Zabīd Sayf al-Dawla Mubārak ibn Munqidh. In every castle he appointed one of his men as his deputy. Their rule in Yemen put down roots and survived. Shams al-Dawla was good to the people of the country and won their sincere allegiance with his justice and goodness. Zabīd came again to a most excellent state of cultivation and security.

Account of the execution of several Egyptians who planned to assassinate Saladin

On 2 Ramaḍān [6 April 1174] Saladin crucified several of the followers of the Alid [Fatimid] caliphs who planned his assassination in Egypt. This came about because

⁴ 'Abd al-Nabī ibn Mahdī was executed by Sayf al-Dawla Mubārak in the absence of Shams al-Dawla (*Sanā al-barq*, 25).

⁵ Yāqūt, i, 855: 'the strongest fortress in Yemen', overlooking Jibla.

a group of the Alid Shia, including the poet ‘Umāra ibn Abīl-Hasan al-Yamānī, ‘Abd al-Ṣamad the secretary, the Cadi al-‘Uwayris, the chief missionary and others [399] of the Fatimid army, their black infantry and the palace courtiers, with the concurrence of several of Saladin’s emirs and soldiers, agreed to summon the Franks from Sicily and the Syrian littoral to Egypt in return for money and land that they offered them. If they attacked, then, if Saladin went against them in person, they would rise up in New and Old Cairo and restore the Alid dynasty and those members of his army who were in concert with them would desert him and he would not be able to stand against the Franks; if Saladin stayed back and sent troops against them, they would rebel against him and seize his person because he would lack help and support. ‘Umāra said, ‘I have removed his brother to Yemen, fearing that he might fill the gap and their loyalty centre on him as successor.’

They sent to the Franks in Sicily and on the Levant coast with this proposal and the plan was agreed and all that remained was for the Franks to set out. However, by God’s grace to the Muslims the Egyptian plotters involved Emir⁶ Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Najā the Preacher, known as Ibn Nujiyya, in this with them. They arranged [who was to be] caliph, vizier, chamberlain, missionary, cadi, but the Ruzzīk family said, ‘The vizier will be one of us’, and the Shāwar family said, ‘The vizier will be one of us’. When Ibn Najā learnt what was afoot, he came before Saladin and informed him of the full truth. He was ordered to stay close, mix with them and go along with their projected actions, keeping him informed of developments one by one. He did this and kept him abreast of all their intentions.

An envoy from the king of the Franks on the Syrian littoral came to Saladin with a gift and a message. Ostensibly he came to him but secretly he came to those plotters, sending them a local Christian and receiving their messengers. Saladin heard news of the true state of affairs from Frankish territory. He arranged for a local Christian, whom he trusted, to keep a watch on the envoy. He won his confidence and was told the truth of the matter by the envoy. Thereupon Saladin arrested [400] the leaders of this plot, namely ‘Umāra, ‘Abd al-Ṣamad, al-‘Uwayris and others and crucified them.

It is said in connection with the uncovering of their plot that ‘Abd al-Ṣamad, mentioned above, whenever he met al-Qādī al-Fāḍil, the secretary of Saladin, used to salute him respectfully and do his utmost to ingratiate himself. He met him one day and paid no attention to him. Al-Qādī al-Fāḍil said, ‘There must be a reason for this’, and feared that he might have gained some personal understanding with Saladin. He summoned ‘Alī ibn Najā the Preacher, told him about the situation and said, ‘I want you to find out what is happening for me’. He accordingly looked into the matter and found nothing as far as Saladin was concerned, so he turned to the other side and discovered the plot. He came to al-Qādī al-Fāḍil and informed him. ‘Go this moment to Saladin,’ he said, ‘and report the matter to him.’ He presented

⁶ The title is unexpected. ‘Imād al-Dīn calls him ‘lawyer, preacher’ (*al-faqīh al-wā’iz*) (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 282).

himself before Saladin, when he was in the mosque, and told him everything. Saladin left and arrested the plotters. After their interrogation and confession, he ordered them to be crucified.

Between ‘Umāra and al-Fādil there was an enmity from the days of al-‘Ādid, indeed before that. When his crucifixion was mooted, al-Qādī al-Fādil stood up and petitioned Saladin for his release. ‘Umāra thought he was urging his destruction and said to Saladin, ‘My lord, do not listen to him concerning me.’ Al-Fādil was angry and left. Saladin said to ‘Umāra, ‘He was interceding for you’, whereupon he was full of regret. ‘Umāra was led out to be crucified and he requested that he should be taken past al-Fādil’s salon. They did this but al-Fādil locked his door and would not meet him. ‘Umāra said:

‘Abd al-Rahīm⁷ has hidden himself;
Deliverance would indeed be a marvel!

He and the others were duly crucified and a proclamation was made among the Fatimid troops that they should depart from Cairo and leave to go to the furthest parts of Upper Egypt. The offspring of al-‘Ādid and others of his family who were in the palace were put under surveillance.

[401] Those of his troops who acted treacherously towards Saladin he did not deal with nor did he tell them that he knew all about them. As for the Franks, those from Sicily attacked Alexandria, as we shall relate, God willing, because it was not communicated to them that the plot had been revealed to Saladin. The Franks of the Syrian littoral made no move because they had learnt the true state of affairs.

‘Umāra was a poet of genius. An example of his verse is:

Had my heart been with me on Kāzima’s day,
I would have mastered it and suppressed the flood of my tears.
A heart whose fondness you can tell sufficiently because
It answered the cry of the departing women, although not called.
My heart is not the first to depart, for me to blame it.
It is the pattern of my life since it was created with me.
It is a false expectation for me to imagine
(Though I knew well once!) that it would remain within my breast.

He also wrote:

I have an excuse for my love of the virgin fawn.
Since tears consoled, no blame has been left for me.
I have for [embracing] waists, kissing cheeks
And caressing breasts some desires and wishes.

⁷ Al-Qādī al-Fādil’s personal name, meaning ‘servant of the Compassionate’.

This is my choice. Agree, if you accept this,
Or do not, but leave me with what I love and choose.

He is the author of a famous collection of poetry of extreme beauty, delicacy and charm.

[402] Account of the death of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī (God have mercy on him)

This year on Wednesday 11 Shawwāl [15 May 1174] Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur, the lord of Syria, the Jazīra and Egypt, died of a quinsy. Initially buried in the Damascus citadel, his body was transferred to the madrasah he had built in Damascus at the Palm Leaf Sellers' Market.

It is a strange coincidence that on 2 Shawwāl [6 May] he rode out with one of his best emirs at his side, who said to him, 'Glory be to Him who knows whether we shall meet here next year or not!' Nūr al-Dīn replied, 'Do not say that. Rather glory be to Him who knows whether we shall meet in a month's time or not!' Nūr al-Dīn (God have mercy on him) died eleven days later and the emir died before the year was out. Each was taken according to his words.

He had embarked on preparations to enter Egypt and take it from Saladin, for he saw in him slackness in waging war on the Franks from his direction and he realized that what prevented Saladin from taking military action was simply fear of himself and of a meeting. He preferred the Franks to be across the route as a buffer against Nūr al-Dīn. The latter sent to Mosul, the Jazīra and Diyār Bakr demanding troops for the expedition. It was his intention to leave them in the hands of his nephew, Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, and to go in person with his troops to Egypt. While he was making these preparations, he received God's decree which cannot be averted.⁸

A doctor, known as the doctor from Rahba,⁹ who treated Nūr al-Dīn and was a very skilled physician, told me the following:

During what became his fatal illness Nūr al-Dīn summoned me along with other doctors. We came to him in a small room in the Damascus citadel, when quinsy already had a firm grip and he was close to death. His voice was hardly

⁸ After quoting the version of this paragraph found in *Bāhir*, 161, Abū Shāma adds 'Had Nūr al-Dīn known the glorious victories that God had in store for Islam at the hands of Saladin after his death, he would have been solaced, for Saladin built on the foundations of the Jihad against the infidels that Nūr al-Dīn laid down and carried it on most perfectly and completely' (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 310-11).

⁹ He was Raḍī al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ḥaydara al-Raḥbī, born in Jazīrat ibn 'Umar in 534/1139, died in Damascus in 631/1233. He also acted as doctor for the Ayyubids ('Uyūn al-anbā', 672-5).

audible. It was where he retired for private worship. His illness began there and he did not move. When we entered and saw his state, I said to him, [403] ‘You ought not to have delayed summoning us until you were seriously ill as now. You ought to move from this place quickly into a light and airy place. It is affecting this illness.’ We began to treat him and advised that he be bled. He said, ‘A sixty-year old is not to be bled’, and he refused. We gave him other treatment but the medicine was of no use. His sickness increased and he died (may God have mercy on him and be pleased with him).

He was swarthy and tall in stature. He had no beard, except for on his chin, and he had a wide forehead. He was a handsome man with charming eyes. His dominion had extended very much and his name was in the khutbah at Mecca and Medina and in Yemen, after Shams al-Dawla ibn Ayyūb had entered and conquered it. He was born in the year 511 [1118]¹⁰ and the fame of his good rule and justice encompassed the world. I have read of the reigns of previous princes and after the rightly-guided caliphs and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz¹¹ I have seen no better reign nor one that aspired more to justice.

We have dealt with much of this in our book *al-Bāhir* about the history of their [the Zankid] dynasty. We shall give here a brief account in the hope that those who wield authority will peruse it and take him as their model. There were for example his asceticism, his piety and his learning.

He used to eat, dress himself and pursue his personal affairs only from property of his own which he had purchased from his share of the booty or from money earmarked for the general good of the Muslims. His wife complained to him of hardship, so he gave her three shops in Homs that he owned, from which he earned about twenty dinars annually. When she considered that not enough, he said to her, ‘I have nothing but this. For everything in my hands I am a custodian for the Muslims and I will not betray them, nor will I wade into Hellfire because of you.’ He used to pray much during the night and had then some fine private prayers.¹² As it is said:

He united both courage and humility before his Lord.
How excellent is the warrior (*mīhrāb*) in the mihrab!

[404] He was knowledgeable in the law according to the school of Abū Ḥanīfa but was not fanatical about it. He studied Ḥadīth and passed it on to others, seeking the reward for that. As for his justice, he did not leave in his lands, for all their breadth, any uncanonical tax or tithe, but in Egypt, Syria, the Jazīra and Mosul he abolished

¹⁰ On Sunday 17 Shawwāl 511/= 10 February 1118 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 313).

¹¹ The one caliph (ruled 717–20 A.D.) of the Umayyad dynasty whose rule was generally approved and considered to be exemplary.

¹² In Arabic *awrād*, sing. *wird*.

them all. He revered the Shariah and stood by its ordinances. A man summoned him to the court of justice, so he went with him and sent to the Cadi Kamāl al-Dīn ibn al-Shahrazūrī, saying, ‘I have been called to answer a case. Behave towards me as you behave with other litigants.’ The right was shown to be his but he granted it to the party who had brought him to court. He said, ‘I wished to allow him what he was claiming. My only fear was that my motive might have been my being too mighty and proud to come before the Shariah court. So I attended and then granted him the claim he made.’ In his land he built the Hall of Justice, where he and the cadi used to sit to give justice to the wronged, even if he were a Jew, against the wrongdoer, even were he his own son or his greatest emir.

As for his bravery, it was of the highest order. At war he used to take two bows and two quivers to fight with. Quṭb al-Dīn al-Nīshābūrī,¹³ the lawyer, said to him, ‘For God’s sake, do not put yourself, Islam and the Muslims at risk. If you are hit in the fray, there will be no Muslim left that is not cut down by the sword.’ Nūr al-Dīn replied, ‘Who is [this] Maḥmūd that such should be said of him? Before me who protected the lands and Islam? That was God, besides whom there is no god.’

As for his public works, he built the walls of the cities and castles of all Syria, for example Damascus, Homs, Hama, Aleppo, Shayzar, Baalbek and others. He built many madrasahs for the Shāfi‘īs and Ḥanafīs and the Nūrī Mosque at Mosul. He built hospitals and caravanserais on the main routes and seminaries for Sufis throughout his lands, for all of which he made large endowments. I have heard that the monthly income from his charitable trusts was 9,000 Tyrian (*ṣūrī*) dinars.

[405] He used to honour and respect the ulema and men of religion. He gave them gifts and would stand up to receive them. He attended their sessions, relaxed with them and never contradicted them. He would also carry on correspondence with them in his own hand. However, he was dignified and inspired awe, despite his humility. In short, his good qualities were numerous and his virtues abundant, more than this book can contain.

Account of the accession of his son al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ

After the death of Nūr al-Dīn his son al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl became ruler to succeed him. He was eleven years old. The emirs and captains swore allegiance to him in Damascus, where he took up residence. In Syria people offered their obedience, as did Saladin in Egypt, making the khutbah and striking coins in his name. His guardianship was taken on by Emir Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, known as Ibn al-Muqaddam, who became the controller of his state. Kamāl al-Dīn ibn al-Shahrazūrī said to him and the emirs with him, ‘You know that

¹³ By error the text has al-Nashāwī. ‘Nishābūrī’ is read in *Bāhir*, 169, and *Rawdatayn*, i, 43. Quṭb al-Dīn, a leading Shāfi‘ī scholar (died 578/1182–3), was the person for whom Nūr al-Dīn began a great madrasah in Damascus in 568/1172–3 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 263–4).

Saladin, the ruler of Egypt, is one of Nūr al-Dīn's mamlukes¹⁴ and his lieutenants are also Nūr al-Dīn's men. The politic course is for us to consult him about what we might do and not exclude him, for he will cease to be obedient to us. He will make that his justification towards us. He is stronger than we are, because today he is in sole control of Egypt.' These words did not suit their aims and they feared that Saladin might enter [Syria] and expel them. It was only a little time later that letters from Saladin came to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ with condolences and congratulations on his accession. He sent Egyptian dinars struck with his name and informed him that the khutbah and allegiance were his, as they had been his father's.

When Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, lord of Mosul, marched and took the cities of the Jazīra, as we shall narrate, Saladin sent again to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ, reprimanding him for not having informed him of Sayf al-Dīn's attack and seizure of territory, so that he could have come to his service and prevented Sayf al-Dīn. He wrote too to Kamāl al-Dīn and the emirs, saying, 'Had Nūr al-Dīn known that among you was one [406] who could take my place or one he could trust as he trusted me, he would have given him Egypt, which is the greatest of his realms and dominions. Had he not died prematurely, he would not have assigned the upbringing of his son and the regency to anyone other than me. I see that you have monopolized my lord and my lord's son and cut me out. I shall surely come to serve him and I shall requite his father's kindness with service the effect of which will be clear and shall reward each of you for your wicked doings in failing to protect his lands.'

Ibn al-Muqaddam and the group of emirs held on to the person of al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and did not send him to Aleppo, for fear that Shams al-Dīn 'Alī ibn al-Dāya might dominate him and exclude them, as he was the greatest of the Nūrī emirs. He was only prevented from joining him and undertaking the regency by an illness that came upon him. He and his brothers were in Aleppo and in control there. Its troops were with them both in the lifetime of Nūr al-Dīn and afterwards. When he was incapable of travelling, he sent to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ, summoning him to Aleppo so that through him he could save the Jazīra lands from Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, the son of his uncle Quṭb al-Dīn. The emirs who were with him did not allow his move to Aleppo for the reasons we have given.

How Sayf al-Dīn took the lands of the Jazīra

Before he fell ill Nūr al-Dīn had sent to the eastern lands, Mosul, the Jazīra and others, summoning their troops for the Jihad, although his purpose was something else. We have already given an account of this. Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, lord of Mosul, set out with his troops, whose advance guard

¹⁴ Here 'mamluke' has no strict sense, implying a period of slave status, but means 'subordinate' or 'retainer'.

was commanded by his eunuch Sa'd al-Dīn Kumushtakīn, whom Nūr al-Dīn had placed in the citadel of Mosul alongside Sayf al-Dīn. When they had covered part of the route, they received news of Nūr al-Dīn's death. Sa'd al-Dīn, who was with the advance guard, fled, leaving his heavy baggage. [407] Sayf al-Dīn took all the equipment and other things that he had and returned to Nisibis, which he took control of. He sent prefects to Khābūr, seized it and assigned it as a fief. Then he proceeded to Ḥarrān which he besieged for several days. It was held by a mamluke of Nūr al-Dīn called Qāymāz al-Ḥarrānī, who offered resistance there. Later he declared his obedience on the basis that Ḥarrān should be his. He descended to do obeisance to Sayf al-Dīn who arrested him and took Ḥarrān from him. On he went to Edessa, which he besieged and gained control of. A black eunuch of Nūr al-Dīn's was in charge there, who surrendered the place and asked in return for the castle of al-Zā'farān in the district of Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar, which was given him but later taken away, so that he was then reduced to begging for his food.

Sayf al-Dīn went to Raqqā and took it and likewise Sarūj. He completed his acquisition of all the lands of the Jazīra, except for Qal'at Ja'bār, as it was very strong, and Ra's 'Ayn, as it belonged to Quṭb al-Dīn, lord of Mardīn, who was Sayf al-Dīn's cousin, and therefore he did not interfere with it.

Shams al-Dīn 'Alī ibn al-Dāya, Nūr al-Dīn's senior emir, was in Aleppo with its troops. He was unable to cross the river to move against Sayf al-Dīn to prevent his taking the towns because he had hemiplegia. He sent to Damascus asking for al-Malik al-Şāliḥ but they did not send him, for the reasons we have mentioned. Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Masīḥ joined Sayf al-Dīn from Sīwās after the death of Nūr al-Dīn. He was the person who established him in power after his father Quṭb al-Dīn and he believed that Sayf al-Dīn would be grateful to him for that. He did not gather the fruits of what he had planted, for he was just one of his emirs. After Sayf al-Dīn had conquered the Jazīra land, Fakhr al-Dīn said to him, 'Your best course is to cross into Syria, for there is no one to resist there.' His senior emir, namely an emir called 'Izz al-Dīn Maḥmūd, known as Zulfandār, said to him, 'You have now gained most of what you father had. The best plan is for you to retire.' He deferred to what he said and returned to Mosul 'that God might accomplish what was already decreed.'¹⁵

[408] How the Franks besieged Bānyās and then retired

After the death of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, lord of Syria, the Franks assembled and marched to the castle of Bānyās in the district of Damascus and put it under siege. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Muqaddam gathered the troops he had at Damascus and marched out. He made contact with the Franks and was mild but later used a rough tone, saying, 'If you make peace with us and withdraw, then we

¹⁵ Koran, viii, 42 and 44.

shall remain on our former terms, but otherwise we shall write to Sayf al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, come to an agreement with him and ask for his support, and we shall write to Saladin in Egypt and ask him for support. Thus we shall invade your lands from all directions and you will not stand against us. You know that Saladin was fearful of meeting Nūr al-Dīn, but now that fear has passed away. If we call him to your lands, he will not refuse.' They realised the truth of what he said, so they reached a settlement in return for some money which they received and some prisoners released to them from Muslim hands. The truce was arranged.

When Saladin heard of this, he was outraged and expressed disapproval of it. He wrote to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ and the emirs around him, blaming them for what they had done and offering on his own part to attack Frankish lands, bring them to battle and deter them from attacking any of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ's territory. His aim was to gain access to Syria to conquer the country. The Syrian emirs only made peace with the Franks out of fear of him and of Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, lord of Mosul, for the latter had already taken the Jazīra lands and they feared that he would cross into Syria. They considered making peace with the Franks better than having the one come from the west and the other from the east, leaving them too busy to repel the Franks.

[409] Miscellaneous events

In Muḥarram this year [August 1173]¹⁶ a fire occurred at Baghdad. Most of Zafariyya¹⁷ and other places too were burnt down. The fire lasted until the following day and then the flames were extinguished.

In Sha'bān [7 March–4 April 1174] Ibn Sankā, who was the nephew of Shumla, lord of Khuzistan, built a castle near al-Māhkī to use it as a strong base to dominate those areas. The caliph sent troops from Baghdad to prevent this. When they met, he charged the right wing in person and put it to flight. A fierce battle was then fought and Shumla's nephew was captured and his head taken to Baghdad, where it was hung on the Nubian Gate. The castle was demolished.

In Ramaḍān [April 1174] continuous rains fell upon Diyār Bakr, the Jazīra and Mosul. They lasted for forty days during which we saw the sun only on two occasions, and each time just for the twinkling of an eye¹⁸. Houses and other structures fell in ruins. The collapses were numerous; many people died beneath them. The Tigris rose greatly, mostly at Baghdad. It rose higher by a little over one cubit than any rise previously recorded since the foundation of Baghdad. People feared being drowned, abandoned the city and stayed on the bank of the Tigris,¹⁹

¹⁶ On the eve of Wednesday 3 Muḥarram/ =15 August (*Muntażam*, x, 242).

¹⁷ A quarter on the east side of Baghdad.

¹⁸ This observation is not from *Muntażam*, so if the 'we' really includes Ibn al-Athīr he would have been almost fourteen years old at the time.

¹⁹ According to Ibn al-Jawzī, 'they pitched tents on high ground in open country'.

fearing that the Qūrij Canal and other places might be breached. When a place was breached they rushed to block it. Water welled from the drains and ruined many houses. It penetrated the ‘Aḍudī Hospital and boats entered through its windows, for the [iron] grilles had been forced out. God showed his kindness to his people by the water's receding after they had been on the point of drowning.²⁰

In Jumādā I [8 December 1173–6 January 1174] there was discord in Baghdad between Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz and the caliph. The reason was that the caliph ordered the return of ‘Aḍud al-Dīn, son of Ra’īs al-Ru’asā’, to [410] the vizierate, but Quṭb al-Dīn prohibited this. He locked the Nubian Gate and the Commoners' Gate and the caliphal palace remained as though it was besieged. The caliph agreed that he should not be made vizier but Quṭb al-Dīn said, ‘Only ‘Aḍud al-Dīn’s expulsion from Baghdad will content me’. Having been ordered to leave, he took refuge with the Chief Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahīm ibn Ismā‘il, who took him to his hospice and gave him protection. He then moved him to the vizier’s residence at Qaṭuftā, where he stayed until he later returned to his own house in Jumādā II [7 January–4 February 1174].

During this year Emir Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad, son of the caliph, who became caliph later, fell from a high dome to the ground of al-Tāj, along with a mamluke of his called Najāḥ, who threw himself after the emir. The caliph’s son and Najāḥ survived. Najāḥ was asked, ‘Why did you throw yourself down?’ He replied, ‘I did not want to survive after my lord.’ The Emir Abū'l-'Abbās bore this in mind and when he became caliph he appointed him chief butler. The whole [caliphal] administration came under his control. He gave him the title al-Malik al-Rahīm ‘Izz al-Dīn and went to great lengths to favour and advance him. All the emirs and viziers in Iraq and others too waited upon him.

In Ramadān [April 1174] large hail fell in Baghdad, the like of which had never been seen. It destroyed houses and killed several men and many cattle. One hailstone was weighed at seven rotls. Most of them were the size of oranges and broke branches. This is what Abū'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī reports in his history and the responsibility is his.²¹

This year there occurred a great battle between al-Mu’ayyad,²² ruler of Nishapur, and the Shāh of Mazandaran. Many on both sides were slain. The Shāh of Mazandaran was defeated and al-Mu’ayyad entered and ravaged the land of Daylam, massacred its people and then withdrew.

Also this year there was a major battle between the inhabitants of Basra Gate and those of Karkh Gate. Its cause was [411] that when the water rose the men of Karkh built a dam which kept the water away from them. It inundated a mosque.

²⁰ The destruction of buildings and crops in the first week or so of Ramadān was immense. Ibn al-Jawzī gives a full description (*Muntazam*, x, 244–7).

²¹ In *Muntazam*, x, 244, lines 17–20. In fact, Ibn al-Jawzī himself quotes ‘a reliable person’.

²² Under the year 568 Ibn al-Athīr records the death of Mu’ayyid al-Dīn Ay-Abā without giving a clear date or making it clear that he died before Sultān Shāh. Barthold, *Turkestan*, 337–8 (quoting Juvainī), says he was killed on 11 July 1174, i.e. in late 569.

There was a tree there that was uprooted. The men of Karkh cried, ‘The tree has been uprooted. God curse the Ten!’²³ Communal disturbance resulted. The caliph ordered ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Tunāmish to restrain them. He was prejudiced against the men of Basra Gate because he was a Shiite. He wished to enter the quarter but the inhabitants prevented him. They shut the gates and positioned themselves on the wall. He wanted to burn down the gates, but this came to the ears of the caliph who admonished him very strongly. He ordered Tunāmish to be recalled, so he withdrew. The disturbance lasted for a week but then the situation was settled without the intervention of any authority.

During this year the emperor of Byzantium crossed the Bosphorus and invaded the land of Qilij Arslān. Warfare ensued in which the Muslims were victorious. When the emperor saw his weakness, he returned home, after a large number of his army had been either killed or taken prisoner.

The following died this year:

Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Mu‘ammar ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Alawī al-Husaynī, the syndic of the Alids at Baghdad, in Jumādā I [December 1173]. He was nicknamed ‘the Pure’.²⁴ He heard and transmitted much Ḥadīth and was an ornament of the Baghdad people.

Al-Ḥafīẓ Abū'l-'Alā' al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-‘Aṭṭār al-Hamadhānī. He travelled much in search of Ḥadīth and studied the ‘readings’ of the Koran and the Arabic language. He was one of the leading scholars of Ḥadīth in his age. He had a high reputation in his home town among the common people and the elite.²⁵

Abū Muḥammad Sa‘īd ibn al-Mubārak, known as Ibn al-Dahhān, the Baghdad grammarian, in Mosul. He was a leading scholar in grammar and the author of famous works, including among others *al-Ghurra*.²⁶

²³ Presumably the men of Karkh exulted in the damage to a Sunni mosque. The ‘Ten’ normally refers to the ten Companions of the Prophet to whom Paradise was guaranteed (*al-‘ashara al-mubashsharūn*), i.e. the first four caliphs and six others. See *EI*(2), viii, 828b. Kohlberg, ‘Some Imāmī Shī‘ī views,’ 168, quotes Ibn Taymiyya to the effect that some Shiites avoided saying ‘ten’ or having anything to do with anything in ten parts, but adds ‘the credibility of this story is diminished by the fact that ‘Alī is one of these ten Companions.’ However, this passage in *Kāmil* shows perhaps that the Shiite mob did not always understand what it was chanting.

²⁴ Reading *al-Tāhir* as in *Muntazam*, x, 247, not *al-Zāhir* as in the text. *Muntazam* gives his death date as the eve of Thursday 20 Jumādā II (sic). However, the same date in Jumādā I corresponds with Thursday 27 December 1173.

²⁵ He died the eve of Thursday 10 Jumādā II/= 17 January 1174, over 80 years of age (*Muntazam*, x, 248).

²⁶ Ibn al-Dahhān (born in Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar in Rajab 494/May 1101; died in Mosul Shawwāl 569/May 1174) was the leading grammarian of his time. Listed among his works is a commentary on the *Kitāb al-Luma‘* of Ibn al-Jinnī, entitled *al-Ghurra* (Yāqūt, *Irshād*, iv, 241; *GAL*, i. 281, Suppl. i, 494).

The arrival of the Sicilian fleet at the city of Alexandria and its departure defeated

In Muḥarram of this year [August 1174] the people of Alexandria and the Egyptian army were victorious over the Frankish fleet from Sicily. This came about because, as we have related, the [Fatimid] Egyptians sent to the king of the Franks on the Syrian littoral and to the ruler of Sicily to engage them to invade Egypt so that they themselves could rise against Saladin and drive him out of Egypt. The ruler of Sicily equipped a large fleet, numbering two hundred galleys carrying men, thirty-six transports carrying horses, six large ships carrying war materials and forty vessels with provisions. In the fleet were 50,000 infantry, 1,500 knights and 500 turcopoles. The commander was the cousin of the ruler of Sicily and his destination in Egypt was Alexandria.

He arrived on 26 Dhū'l-Hijja 569 [28 July 1174] when the inhabitants were not expecting them and feeling secure. They sallied forth with their weapons and equipment to prevent their disembarkation and went some distance from the town. The man in charge of them stopped that and ordered them to stay close to the wall. The Franks disembarked close to the open sea and the lighthouse and advanced towards the town, where they erected siege towers and trebuchets and began a fierce attack. [413] The inhabitants held firm against them, although they had only a few regular troops with them. The Franks were amazed at what they saw of the bravery of the Alexandrians and their excellent weaponry.

Letters reporting the situation were dispatched to Saladin to summon him to repel the enemy. On the first day the fighting lasted until the end of daylight and then the Franks renewed it on the second day. They made great efforts and kept up their assaults until the towers arrived close to the wall. That day all the Muslim troops who were at their fiefs that were close to Alexandria arrived. The spirits of the people were much strengthened by them and they fought well and stoutly. On the third day the Muslims opened the town gate and emerged to attack the Franks from every direction when they were off their guard. Great was the shouting on all sides. The Franks were alarmed and the fighting became intense. The Muslims, having reached the siege towers, set fire to them and fought stoutly until God sent down His aid to them and His signs became manifest. They continued to be engaged in combat until the end of the day, when they entered the town rejoicing and welcoming the auguries of victory and their dominance that they had seen, compared with the faint-heartedness and weakening military effort of the Franks and the number of dead and wounded among their infantry.

When news of this reached Saladin, he set out with his troops and sent on a

mamluke of his with three spare horses to ride with all speed to Alexandria to bring the news of his coming. He also sent a detachment of troops to Damietta as he feared for her too and took precautions. The mamluke arrived at Alexandria that same day at the time of late afternoon prayer, when people had retired from combat. He proclaimed in the town that Saladin and the army were coming speedily. When they heard that, they resumed the fight, as their tiredness and the pain of their wounds had gone, each one imagining that Saladin was with him as he fought like one who wished Saladin could witness how he fought.

[414] The Franks heard that Saladin was approaching with his army. Their morale collapsed and their fatigue and weakness increased. As darkness was falling the Muslims charged them and gained their tents, which they seized with the many weapons and abundant baggage in them. Great was the slaughter among the Frankish foot-soldiers but many of them fled to the sea and brought their galleys close into the shore, so that they could embark. Some survived and got on board but others drowned. A Muslim dived into the water and holed one of the Frankish galleys which sank. The rest were fearful of that and turned away in flight. Three hundred Frankish knights took refuge on the top of a hill. The Muslims engaged them until the following day and, after the fighting had continued until midday, the men of the town overwhelmed and subdued them. They were either killed or taken prisoner. Thus God delivered the Muslims from their wickedness; their own wiles enmeshed the infidels.

Account of al-Kanz's uprising in Upper Egypt

At the beginning of this year [began 2 August 1174] al-Kanz¹ rose in rebellion in Upper Egypt. A large host of the local people, blacks, Arabs and others flocked to him. One of Saladin's emirs was there at his fief, namely the brother of Emir Abū'l-Hayjā' the Fat, and he was killed by al-Kanz. His brother, one of the greatest and bravest emirs, was outraged at his killing and marched to fight al-Kanz. Saladin sent with him several emirs and a good many of the army. They came to the town of Ṭawd,² which resisted them. They fought the inhabitants, overcame them and killed many of them who were reduced to a humiliated and subdued state after wielding power.

After they had finished with Ṭawd, the army marched towards al-Kanz, who was lost in his tyrannical course. After bringing him to battle, he and the Arabs and

¹ The Banū al-Kanz were Arabs who had emigrated from the Arabian Peninsula and settled in Upper Egypt. Their rule in Aswan was recognized by the Fatimids and successive emirs were granted the title Kanz al-Dawla. In 568/1172 this present Kanz al-Dawla Mutawwaj had cooperated with a force sent by Saladin against Nubian incursions. See *Rawdatayn*, ii, 245; *EI*(2), iv, 567–8.

² Yāqūt, iii, 565: a small town in Upper Egypt, 'above Qūs and below Aswān'.

others with him were killed. After him the land became safe and its people lived in peace and security.

[415] How Saladin conquered Damascus

On the last day³ of Rabī‘ I this year [=28 October 1174] Saladin conquered the city of Damascus. This came about as follows. After Nūr al-Dīn died, his son al-Malik al-Şāliḥ succeeded him and was at Damascus. Sa‘d al-Dīn Kumushtakīn had fled from Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī to Aleppo, as we have related, and he remained there with Shams al-Dīn ibn al-Dāya. When Sayf al-Dīn gained control of the Jazīra lands, Ibn al-Dāya feared that he would attack⁴ Aleppo and seize it, so he sent Sa‘d al-Dīn to Damascus to summon al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and the troops with him to Aleppo. When he drew near to Damascus, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Muqaddam sent a force against him which plundered him. He returned defeated to Aleppo, where Ibn al-Dāya compensated him with replacements for what had been taken from him. Subsequently the emirs in Damascus consulted their best interests and realized that his moving to Aleppo would be better for the state than his remaining in Damascus. They therefore sent to Ibn al-Dāya asking him to send Sa‘d al-Dīn to fetch al-Malik al-Şāliḥ. He was duly equipped and sent on his way. ‘It’s herself whom Barāqish harms.’⁵ He travelled to Damascus in Muḥarram [August 1174] and took al-Malik al-Şāliḥ back to Aleppo. On their arrival, Sa‘d al-Dīn arrested Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-Dāya and his brothers and also Ra‘īs ibn al-Khashshāb, the headman of Aleppo and leader of the militia there. Had it not been for the illness of Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-Dāya, he would not have been able to do that.

Sa‘d al-Dīn thus gained sole control of al-Malik al-Şāliḥ. Ibn al-Muqaddam and other emirs in Damascus were fearful and said, ‘When the situation in Aleppo is stabilized, he will take al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and march with him against us and act similarly to the way he has acted in Aleppo.’ So they wrote to Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, lord of Mosul, suggesting he cross over the Euphrates to them, so they could hand over Damascus to him. He did not do so, however, fearing that it might be a trap, [416] to get him to cross the Euphrates, go to Damascus, be refused entry and attacked from the rear by his cousin and the Aleppan standing army and so be destroyed. This was the advice given him by ‘Izz al-Dīn Zulfandār. A coward counts distance from evil as being close and thinks cowardice discretion, as is said:

³ *Rawdatayn*, ii, 339, specifies a ‘Monday’.

⁴ The text reads *yughīr ilā* ‘attack, raid’, although one would expect the preposition ‘*alā*. One suspects that the original reading was *ya‘bur ilā* ‘cross [the river] to’. Cf. p. [408] above and immediately below.

⁵ A proverb, which is applied to one whose action rebounds harmfully on oneself. The story is either that a dog called Barāqish barked and betrayed his people to their enemies or that Barāqish, the wife of a certain Luqmān ibn ‘Adī, introduced him to camel meat, to the detriment of her people’s herds! See *Mustaqṣā*, ii, 165.

Cowards think that cowardice is discretion.
Such is the cowardly man's nature.

When Zulfandār advised this line of thought, he accepted it and refused to go to Damascus. He wrote to Sa'd al-Dīn and al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and made peace with them, by which the territory he had taken was to be recognized. After his refusal to cross to Damascus, their fear [in Damascus] was great and they said, 'Now that Sayf al-Dīn has made terms with them, there is nothing left to stop them marching against us.' At that they corresponded with Saladin, lord of Egypt, and invited him to come to be made ruler over them. The leading man in this was Shams al-Dīn Ibn al-Muqaddam. He showed himself 'a chip off the old block',⁶ for we have mentioned how his father acted falsely when he surrendered Sinjār in the year 544 [1149–50].

When the messengers brought this invitation to Saladin, he did not hesitate but rode off unencumbered with baggage with 700 cavalrymen, although the Franks were across his route. He paid no attention to them. When he trod Syrian soil he made for Buşrā, where its lord at that time was one of the number who had written to him. He came out to meet Saladin but, seeing how few were the troops with him, he feared for himself and met with al-Qādī al-Fāḍil and said, 'I do not see an army with you. This is a large land, one not to be invaded by such a force as this. If those here resist you for an hour of the day, the country folk will take you. If you have money with you, the business will be easy.' 'We have a lot of money,' he replied, 'it could be 50,000 dinars.' The lord of Buşrā clapped his hands to his head and said, 'You are done for and you have done for us too!' All they had with them was 10,000 dinars.⁷

Saladin went on to Damascus,⁸ where all the troops came out to meet him and paid him their respects. Having made his entry, he lodged in his father's house, known as the house of al-'Aqīqī. [417] The citadel was in the hands of a eunuch, whose name was Rayḥān. Saladin summoned Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Shahrazūrī, the cadi and the authoritative voice in all affairs of state administration, charitable trusts and other matters, and sent him to Rayḥān to get him to surrender the citadel. Saladin said, 'I am the mamluke of al-Malik al-Şāliḥ. I have come only to aid and serve him and to restore to him the lands that have been taken from him.' At that time he was making the khutbah in al-Şāliḥ's name in all his lands. Kamāl al-Dīn went up to meet Rayḥān and persisted with him until he gave up the citadel. Saladin then entered and seized and took away all the money within. It made him rich, established his position and strengthened his resolve. Despite this, he was making a show of obedience to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ, designating himself in correspondence as 'his mamluke' and leaving the khutbah and the coinage in his name.

⁶ Ibn al-Athīr quotes a proverb here: 'One who resembles his father does no wrong'.

⁷ Did he guess that al-Qādī al-Fāḍil was exaggerating?

⁸ Saladin left Buşrā Wednesday 24 Rabī' I/23 October 1174 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 341).

How Saladin took the cities of Homs and Hama

When Saladin's rule was firmly established in Damascus and he had organized its affairs, he left his brother Sayf al-Islām Ṭughtakīn ibn Ayyūb as his deputy there and marched to Homs on 1 Jumādā I [28 November 1174]. Homs, Hama, the castle of Ba'rīn, Salamiyya, Tell Khālid and Edessa in the Jazīra were in the fief of Emir Fakhr al-Dīn Mas'ūd al-Za'farānī. After Nūr al-Dīn's death, he was unable to hold on to them because of his wicked rule over their inhabitants and he had no control over the castles of these cities. They were held by lieutenants of Nūr al-Dīn. In Homs' citadel there was a governor who held it. When Saladin descended upon Homs on 11th of the above month [8 December 1174], he made contact with the garrison about surrender but they refused. The next day he engaged them. The city fell⁹ and the people were granted protection, but the citadel held out and continued to hold out until Saladin's return from Aleppo, as we shall relate, God willing. Meanwhile he left men in Homs to guard the city, to deny the citadel's garrison any freedom of action and stop any provisions reaching them.

He then went to Hama, all the while, whatever he was doing, proclaiming his loyalty to al-Malik [418] al-Şāliḥ ibn Nūr al-Dīn and that he had only taken the field to protect his lands from the Franks and to recover the Jazīra territory that Sayf al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, had seized. When he arrived at Hama, he took the town on 1 Jumādā II [28 December 1174]. Holding the citadel was Emir 'Izz al-Dīn Jūrdīk, one of Nūr al-Dīn's mamlukes, who refused to surrender it to Saladin. Saladin sent to tell him of his loyalty to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and that he only wanted to preserve his lands for him. Jūrdīk made him swear to that, which he did and then sent Jūrdīk to Aleppo about creating a united obedience to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and freeing Shams al-Dīn 'Alī, Ḥasan and 'Uthmān, the Banū al-Dāya, from prison. Jūrdīk set off for Aleppo and left his brother¹⁰ as his deputy in the citadel of Hama to hold it. When he arrived at Aleppo, Kumushtakīn arrested and imprisoned him. After hearing this, his brother surrendered the citadel into the control of Saladin.¹¹

Account of Saladin's siege of Aleppo, his withdrawal and his taking of the citadel of Homs and Baalbek

After Saladin had taken Hama he went to Aleppo and put it under siege on 3 Jumādā II [30 December 1174]. The inhabitants resisted him and al-Malik al-Şāliḥ, who was a young boy twelve years old, rode out, gathered the people of Aleppo and said to them, 'You know well my father's kindness to you, his love for you and

⁹ 'Imad al-Dīn: on Tuesday 13 Jumādā I/10 December 1174 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 353).

¹⁰ Shams al-Dīn 'Alī (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 347).

¹¹ On 1 Jumādā II/28 December 1174. Saladin put Mubāriz al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Abī'l-Fawāris in charge (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 348).

his good rule over you. I am his orphan. This wicked man, who repudiates my father's goodness to him, has come to take my lands. He respects neither God Almighty nor his creatures.' He spoke much in this vein, wept and reduced the people to tears. They offered him their wealth and their lives and agreed to fight to protect him and defend his lands. They fought manfully, for they had courage, having become familiar with, and accustomed to, war, [419] seeing that the Franks were in the vicinity. They were making sorties and engaging Saladin near Mount Jawshan,¹² so he was unable to get close to the city.

Sa'd al-Dīn Kumushtakīn sent to Sinān, the leader of the Ismā'īlīs and offered him large sums to kill Saladin. They sent a band of their men to his camp. When they arrived, an emir called Khumārtakīn, lord of the castle of Abū Qubays, saw and recognized them, because he was their neighbour who met and fought with them often. When he saw them, he said to them, 'What has brought you here? On what business have you come?' They wounded him with some deadly blows and one of their number charged towards Saladin to slay him but was killed before he could reach him. The rest of the Ismā'īlīs began to fight and killed several persons before they themselves were killed.

Saladin continued to besiege Aleppo until the end of Jumādā II [25 January 1175] and withdrew on 1 Rajab [26 January]. The reason for his withdrawal was that Count Raymond of St Gilles, lord of Tripoli, whom Nūr al-Dīn had taken prisoner at Hārim in the year 559 [1164] and who remained in captivity until this present time, was released by Sa'd al-Dīn for 150,000 Tyrian dinars and 1,000 prisoners. When he reached home, the Franks gathered to congratulate him on his safe return, for he was a great man amongst them, one of their leading devils. It chanced that Amaury, king of the Franks (God curse him) had died at the beginning of this year. He was one of the bravest of their kings, the most outstanding for policy, cunning and intrigue. At his death he left a leper son, who was incapable of ruling. The Franks made him king in name with no substance to his position. The conduct of affairs was undertaken by Count Raymond with power of loosing and binding, whose command all followed.

The men in Aleppo sent to him, asking him to attack some of the territory in Saladin's hands to make him raise the siege. As a result the Count went to Homs which he besieged on 7 Rajab [1 February]. When he made his preparations for this attack, Saladin heard the news and departed from Aleppo. He reached Hama on 8 Rajab [2 February], a day after the Franks had descended upon Homs. He then moved to Rastan and when the Franks heard that he was close they withdrew from Homs. Saladin then arrived and laid siege to [420] the citadel and took it on 21 Sha'bān [17 March 1175]. Most of Syria was now in his hands.

After the fall of Homs he proceeded to Baalbek, where was a eunuch named Yumn, who had been governor there from the days of Nūr al-Dīn. When Saladin put it under siege, Yumn sent requesting terms for himself and those with

¹² To the west of Aleppo beyond the River Quwayq.

him.¹³ Saladin granted terms and the citadel was handed over on 4 Ramaḍān of this year [29 March 1175].

Account of Sayf al-Dīn's siege of his brother 'Imād al-Dīn in Sinjār

After Saladin had taken control of Damascus, Homs and Hama, al-Malik al-Şāliḥ Ismā'īl, son of Nūr al-Dīn, wrote to his cousin Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd to ask for his support against Saladin and to request that he cross [the Euphrates] to attack Saladin and take the lands from him. Sayf al-Dīn mobilized his troops and wrote to his brother 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī, lord of Sinjār, ordering him to present himself with his troops, so that they could unite for an expedition to Syria, but he refused to do this.

Saladin had written to 'Imād al-Dīn and encouraged him to aspire to sovereignty because he was the older [brother]. Ambition led him to refuse to obey his brother. When Sayf al-Dīn saw his recalcitrance, he equipped his brother 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd with a large force, the majority of his army, and sent him to Syria. Alongside his brother he appointed 'Izz al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who was also known as Zulfandār, as commander and gave him overall control of affairs. Sayf al-Dīn himself went to Sinjār and laid siege to it during the month of Ramaḍān [26 March-24 April 1175]. He made assaults and pressed them hard but 'Imād al-Dīn held out and led an excellent defence and resistance. The siege continued and while Sayf al-Dīn was engaged in it, news came to him of the defeat of his army,¹⁴ [421] which was with his brother 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd, at the hands of Saladin. Thereupon he made contact with his brother 'Imād al-Dīn, made peace with him, recognizing what he held, and left for Mosul. After this defeat [of the Zankids] Saladin became firmly established and people were fearful of him. Envoys went to and fro between him and Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī concerning peace but nothing was agreed.

Account of the defeat of Sayf al-Dīn's army at the hands of Saladin and his siege of the city of Aleppo

This year Sayf al-Dīn's army, with his brother 'Izz al-Dīn and 'Izz al-Dīn Zulfandār, went to Aleppo and they were joined by the local troops. All then set out to make war on Saladin, who wrote to Sayf al-Dīn offering to hand over Homs and Hama [on condition] that he would keep the city of Damascus in his hands, holding it as the lieutenant of al-Malik al-Şāliḥ. Sayf al-Dīn did not accept this and

¹³ Ibn Abī Tayy said that Yumn was concerned at the size of the attacking force, consulted Aleppo by pigeon post but received no answer, so asked for terms (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 374).

¹⁴ See the following section.

replied, ‘It is imperative that you surrender all the Syrian territory you have taken and return to Egypt.’

Saladin had been gathering his forces and preparing for war. When Sayf al-Dīn refused to accept his offer, he marched with his troops towards ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd and Zulfandār. They met on 19 Ramaḍān [13 April 1175] near the city of Hama at a place called the Horns of Hama. Zulfandār was ignorant of military matters and fighting, unacquainted with their practice, in addition to being a coward, although he had been granted good fortune and favour by Sayf al-Dīn. When the two sides met, Sayf al-Dīn’s force did not hold firm but fled, every man looking out for himself. Sayf al-Dīn’s brother, ‘Izz al-Dīn, stood firm after the rout of his men. When Saladin saw his steadfastness, he said, ‘Either this is the bravest of men or he has no knowledge of warfare.’ He ordered his men to charge him, which they did [422] and drove him from his position. Their rout then became complete.

Saladin and his troops pursued them past their camp and they took much booty, equipment, abundant weapons and swift horses. After a lengthy campaign they returned to rest, while the defeated retired to Aleppo. Saladin followed and besieged them there, blockading and carrying out assaults. At that time he dropped the khutbah for al-Malik al-Şāliḥ ibn Nūr al-Dīn and removed his name from the coinage in his lands. He maintained the siege but when the operation dragged on, he made peace overtures, on condition that he should keep what he held in Syria and they should keep what they held. They agreed to this and peace was made.¹⁵ Saladin withdrew from Aleppo during the first ten days of Shawwāl [25 April–4 May 1175] and came to Hama,¹⁶ where he received investiture robes from the Caliph, brought by his envoy.

Account of Saladin’s capture of the castle of Ba‘rīn

This year during the first ten days of Shawwāl [25 April–4 May 1175]¹⁷ Saladin took the castle of Ba‘rīn in Syria. Its lord was Fakhr al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn al-Za‘farānī, one of the greatest of Nūr al-Dīn’s emirs. When he saw the power of Saladin, he left the castle and met with Saladin in the belief that he would receive him with honour, share power with him and take no decision without consulting him, as had been the case with Nūr al-Dīn, but he did not see any of that, so parted from him. Only Ba‘rīn was left to him of his fief he had held in the reign of Nūr al-Dīn and he had his deputy there. When Saladin made peace with al-Malik al-Şāliḥ in Aleppo, he returned to Hama and then went to Ba‘rīn, which was one of its

¹⁵ Ibn Abī Tayy who saw the treaty says that al-Malik al-Şāliḥ was guaranteed the khutbah and coinage in all the lands Saladin controlled (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 384).

¹⁶ On Monday 12 Shawwāl = 5 May 1175 (*Sanā al-barq*, 88).

¹⁷ Imād al-Dīn dates the surrender of Ba‘rīn during ‘the last [sic] ten days’ of Shawwāl/14–23 May (*Sanā al-barq*, 89).

villages. He besieged the castle and erected trebuchets to attack it. He persisted with the assault until its governor surrendered on terms. [423] Having taken control of it, he returned to Hama, which he assigned as a fief to his maternal uncle, Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Tekesh al-Hārimī. He also gave Homs as a fief to Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad, the son of his uncle Shirkūh. He then went to Damascus, which he entered in the last days of Shawwāl [ended 23 May 1175].

How Pahlawān took the city of Tabriz

Pahlawān, the son of Īldikiz, took the city of Tabriz this year, part of the territory of Āqsunqur al-Aḥmadīlī. This came about because Pahlawān marched to Marāgha and put it under siege, after its lord Āqsunqur al-Aḥmadīlī had died and willed the succession to his son Falak al-Dīn. Pahlawān moved against the latter and descended on the castle of Rūyīn Diz,¹⁸ which he put under siege. It held out against him, so he abandoned it and besieged Marāgha. He also sent his brother, Qizil Arslān, with an army to Tabriz and it too was besieged.

While Pahlawān was engaged with the men of Marāgha, a detachment of his troops were seized. The cadi of Marāgha, Ṣadr al-Dīn, bestowed robes on them and set them free. This met with Pahlawān's approbation. The cadi then embarked on peace negotiations, on the basis of the surrender of Tabriz to Pahlawān. This was accepted and an agreement was reached on that basis. Each swore an oath to the other and Pahlawān took over Tabriz and gave it to his brother Qizil Arslān. He himself departed from Tabriz.

Account of the death of Shumla

The lord of Khuzistan, Shumla the Turkoman, died this year. His realm had grown large and his power great, for he built several fortresses and continued thus for more than twenty years. [424] He died because he aimed to attack some Turkomans, who, learning of this, sought the aid of Shams al-Dīn Pahlawān, son of Īldikiz, the lord of Iraq al-‘Ajām. He sent an army to them. In the ensuing battle, Shumla was struck by an arrow and then he, his son and his nephew were taken prisoner. Two days later he died. He was one of the Afshar¹⁹ Turkomans. After his death his son became ruler.

¹⁸ See Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 154 (Ruwīn Diz, '3 leagues distant from Marāgha') and Krawulsky, 522 (Rovein-Diz).

¹⁹ The text has al-Aqshariyya. The Afshars were a tribe among the Oghuz Turkomans who invaded the Islamic East in the 11th century. See *EI*(2), i, 230-40.

Account of the flight of Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz from Baghdad

In Shawwāl of this year [25 April–23 May 1175] ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Tunāmish, one of the greatest emirs in Baghdad, whose sister’s husband was Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz,²⁰ sent troops to al-Gharrāl²¹ who plundered the inhabitants and inflicted extensive harm on them. A group of these people came to Baghdad and pleaded for help but received none because of the caliph’s weakness alongside Qāymāz and Tunāmish who dominated him. These people made for the palace mosque and raised their cry for help there. They interrupted the preacher and most people missed the prayer session. The caliph disapproved of what had happened but neither Quṭb al-Dīn nor Tunāmish paid any attention to what he did. They treated him with contempt and it is no surprise that God Almighty did not grant them much respite on account of their contempt for supplication and their disdain for those that have recourse to it.

When it was 5 Dhū'l-Qa'da [28 May 1175] Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz sought to damage Zahīr al-Dīn ibn al-'Aṭṭār, the chief of the Storeroom and an intimate of the caliph who had every concern for his welfare. Qāymāz showed no regard for the caliph in dealing with his friend. He sent, summoning him to appear before him, but Ibn al-'Aṭṭār fled, at which Quṭb al-Dīn set fire to his house and got the emirs to swear that they would give aid and support. He gathered them together and moved against the caliphal palace because he knew that Ibn al-'Aṭṭār was there. When the caliph became aware of that and saw [the threat of] defeat, he climbed onto the palace roof, appeared to the common people and ordered a servant to cry out for assistance. He shouted to the mob, ‘Quṭb al-Dīn's wealth is yours and his blood is mine!’ so the whole crowd attacked Quṭb al-Dīn's house [425] to sack it. He was unable to make a stand because of the narrowness of the streets and the overwhelming force of the mob. He fled from his house through a hole he opened at the back of it because of the size of the crowd at the main entrance. He left Baghdad and his house was sacked. The goods that were taken from it were more than could be listed or counted. A level of luxury, such as nobody had ever possessed, was revealed. To illustrate this is the fact that the privy, which he had, had a gold chain hanging from the ceiling till just opposite the face of any seated occupant. At the bottom of it was a large gold ball which was perforated and stuffed with musk and ambergris for him to smell as he sat there. A man swung on it, broke it and took it away.

One pauper entered and seized several purses full of dinars. Powerful individuals had stationed themselves at the entrance to seize what people came out with. When this pauper took the purses, he made for the kitchen and there took a pot full of cooked food, into which he threw the purses. He then carried it off on his head, while people were laughing at him as he was saying, ‘I want something

²⁰ The reading of *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 280, has been followed, and cf. *Muntażam*, x, 253.

²¹ The canal of this name flows from the Tigris south of Wāsiṭ (Krawulsky, 481). See Yāqūt, iii, 780–81: a large canal between Wāsiṭ and Başra, on which were several villages.

to feed my family with today'. So he escaped with what he had and enjoyed riches subsequently when the money could be revealed. Within an hour not a thing, great or small, remained of Quṭb al-Dīn's vast fortune.

When he left the city, Tunāmish and several emirs followed him and their houses were sacked too. Their goods were seized and most of them were burnt. Quṭb al-Dīn went to Ḥilla, accompanied by the emirs. The caliph sent Ṣadr al-Dīn the Chief Shaykh to him but Quṭb al-Dīn kept him guessing until he left Ḥilla for Mosul overland. He and those with him suffered from great thirst. Most of them perished from the severe heat and the thirst. Before reaching Mosul Quṭb al-Dīn died. His body was carried there and buried outside the 'Imādī Gate. His tomb there is still well-known.

Such is the result of disobeying the caliph, of ingratitude for kindness, of wickedness and bad administration, for he behaved with tyranny towards the people of Iraq and was ungrateful for the kindnesses of the caliph with which he was showered. Had he remained in Ḥilla, collected troops and returned to Baghdad, he would have gained his former control of all affairs. The common people of Baghdad were in favour of him. He had a strong hold on the country and they obeyed him.

After Quṭb al-Dīn's death in Dhū'l-Hijja [July 1175]²² 'Alā' al-Dīn Tunāmish came to Mosul and remained there [426] for a little while. The caliph then ordered him to come to Baghdad, so he returned and lived there without a fief until his death. This was the end of their career.

When Quṭb al-Dīn resided in Ḥilla, the pilgrims refused to travel and they delayed until he had departed. After leaving Kufa they came to 'Arafāt in eighteen days. The like of this had never been heard of. However, many of them missed the [period of] the Pilgrimage.

After the flight of Quṭb al-Dīn the caliph bestowed robes of honour on 'Aḍud al-Dīn, the vizier, and restored him to the office. A certain poet delivered these verses about Quṭb al-Dīn and Tunāmish:

If you contemplate ephemeral power and events that speedily pass into night,
Then forget the early wonders and histories and consider Qāymāz and Ibn
Qumāj.
Fate turned against them and gave them from its cup a pure draught without
admixture.
For palaces, their shade and luxury, they exchanged wastes and ravines.
May those who remain be cautious of the like, the blows of deceitful,
troublesome fate.

²² News of his death reached Baghdad Friday 27 Dhū'l-Hijja/ = 18 July 1175 (*Muntazam*, x, 254).

Quṭb al-Dīn was honourable, open of face, a lover of justice and doing good, who bestowed much money. What he did he was incited to do by Tunāmish. It was not by his own wish.

Miscellaneous events

This year the Chief of the Storeroom Za'īm al-Dīn, died. His name was Yaḥyā ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Mu'ammār ibn Ja'far, Abū'l-Fadl. He led the people on the Pilgrimage for several years and had full authority on the route. He acted also as deputy vizier. For more than twenty years he alternated between these offices and he also knew the Koran by heart.²³

²³ He died Saturday 19 Rabī' I/18 October 1174 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 254).

Account of the defeat of Sayf al-Dīn at the hands of Saladin

This year on 10 Shawwāl [22 April 1176] at Sultan's Hill,¹ one day's journey from Aleppo on the Hama road, the battle between Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Mawdūd and Saladin took place in which Sayf al-Dīn was defeated.

This came about because, after the defeat of his brother, ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd, by Saladin in the previous year and after his coming to terms with his [other] brother, ‘Imad al-Dīn the lord of Sinjār, Sayf al-Dīn returned to Mosul, gathered his troops, distributed money to them and asked for support from the lord of Ḥisn Kayfā, the lord of Mardīn and others. Large forces assembled with him, whose number reached 6,000 horse. In Rabī‘ I this year [21 September-18 October 1175] he went to Nisibis, where he stayed for a long while until the end of the winter. His army became disgruntled and the monies they had received were exhausted. To return home with defeat became preferable to victory, because they expected, if they were victorious, a further extended stay in Syria to follow this period.

Then Sayf al-Dīn came to Aleppo, where he was met by the eunuch Sa‘d al-Dīn Kumushtakīn, regent of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, with the troops of Aleppo. Saladin had only a few troops because he had made peace with the Franks in Muḥarram of this year [22 July-20 August 1175], as we shall mention, God willing, [428] and he had sent his forces to Egypt. He now sent to summon them. Had [his enemies] moved against him expeditiously, they would have achieved their aim, but they delayed and moved too late. Meanwhile his troops came to him and he left Damascus² to go towards Aleppo to confront Sayf al-Dīn. The two armies came into contact at Sultan's Hill. Sayf al-Dīn had arrived first and when Saladin arrived, it was already the evening and he and his men were tired and thirsty. They threw themselves down on the ground, unable to move further. Several persons advised Sayf al-Dīn to attack them while they were in this state, but Zulfandār said, ‘We have no need to engage this rebel at this hour. Tomorrow early we shall seize them all.’ Sayf al-Dīn therefore put off the battle until the next day.

In the morning they drew up their battle lines. Zulfandār, who was the commander of Sayf al-Dīn's army, placed his banners in a depression in the land where they could only be seen by those who were close to them. When the men could not see them, they imagined that the sultan had fled the field, so they did not

¹ Tell al-Sultān, about 23 miles (37 km) south of Aleppo. It was so named because Sultan Alp Arslān pitched his tent there when besieging Aleppo in 462/1070 (see Bianquis, *Damas*, 592).

² During Ramadān/14 March-12 April 1176, according to ‘Imād al-Dīn (*Sanā al-barq*, 94).

stand firm but fled, everyone looking out for himself. From both sides, despite their large numbers, only one person was killed.

Sayf al-Dīn reached Aleppo, where he left his brother ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd with a part of his army. He himself did not stay but crossed the Euphrates and travelled on to Mosul, not believing that he would survive. He thought that Saladin would cross the Euphrates and attack Mosul. He consulted his vizier, Jalāl al-Dīn, and Mujaħid al-Dīn Qāymāz about abandoning Mosul and taking refuge in the castle of ‘Aqr al-Ḥumaydiyya. Mujaħid al-Dīn said to him, ‘Do you think, if Mosul were taken from you, that you could hold out in one of the towers of the outer wall?’ ‘No,’ he replied. ‘Well, a tower in the outer wall is better than ‘Aqr. Princes are always being defeated and then take up the battle again.’ He and the vizier agreed to support him and strengthen his morale. So Sayf al-Dīn stayed where he was and later turned away from Zulfandār and dismissed him. In his place he appointed as commander of the armies Mujaħid al-Dīn Qāymāz, as we shall relate, God willing.

[429] The Secretary ‘Imād al-Dīn mentioned in his book *al-Barq al-Shāmī*³ on the history of Saladin’s reign that Sayf al-Dīn’s army at this battle numbered 20,000 cavalry. That was not so. It was quite certainly more than 6,000 horse but less than 6,500, for I have perused the review register. The official who administered and wrote it was my brother Majd al-Dīn Abū'l-Sa‘ādāt al-Mubārak ibn Muħammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm (God have mercy in him). Al-‘Imād’s intention was simply to exaggerate the deeds of his master by stating that with 6,000 he defeated 20,000, but the truth better deserves to be followed. What is more, I wish I knew how large is Mosul with its dependencies up to the Euphrates that it could have and maintain 20,000 cavalry!

Account of the lands of al-Şāliħ ibn Nūr al-Dīn that Saladin conquered after this [Zankid] defeat

After the defeat of Sayf al-Dīn and his army and their arrival at Aleppo, Sayf al-Dīn returned to Mosul, as we have related. In Aleppo he left his brother ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd with a detachment of his army as reinforcements for al-Malik al-Şāliħ. After Saladin and his troops had taken the baggage train of the Mosul army, they seized it as booty which made them rich and added to their strength. Saladin went to Buzā‘a, put it under siege and engaged the citadel’s defenders. Later he accepted its surrender⁴ and stationed men there to guard it. He proceeded to Manbij and put it under siege at the end of Shawwāl [11 May 1176]. It was held by Quṭb al-Dīn Yināl ibn Ḥassān al-Manbijī, who was a fierce enemy of Saladin, agitating and inciting hostility to him and attacking him personally. Therefore Saladin was

³ The extant material begins from 573/1177–8. Cf. *Sanā al-barq*, 94.

⁴ On Monday 22 Shawwāl/4 May 1176 (*Sanā al-barq*, 99).

exasperated with him and made threats against him. He took the town which did not resist him, but the citadel remained, held by its lord who had gathered there men, weapons and stores. [430] Saladin besieged him and pressed him hard, carrying out assaults on the citadel. The sappers reached the wall, mined it and the place was taken by storm. Saladin's troops took everything within as booty. Saladin took its lord Yīnāl prisoner and took all his wealth, leaving him poor, not possessing a bean. Subsequently Saladin released him and he went to Mosul, where Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī assigned him the city of Raqqā as a fief.

Having finished with Manbij, Saladin then went to the castle of A'zāz, descending upon it on 3 Dhū'l-Qa'da [14 May 1176]. It is one of the strongest and most defensible of castles. He encircled it with a strict siege and blockade of all within and erected trebuchets to attack it. Many of his army were killed in the assaults.

One day while Saladin was in a tent belonging to one of his emirs, called Jāwulī, the commander of the Asadī troop, a Bāṭinī leapt on him, struck him on the head with a dagger and wounded him. Had it not been for the mailed helmet under his cap he would have been killed. Saladin grasped the Bāṭinī's hand in his, although he was unable totally to prevent him striking a blow. However, he could only give him weak blows. The Bāṭinī continued striking him on the neck with his dagger. Saladin was wearing a brigandine and the blows fell on the collar of the brigandine, cutting into it. The chain mail prevented the blows reaching his neck, because his allotted end was still some way off. An emir, whose name was Yāzkush, came forward and seized the dagger in his hand. The Bāṭinī wounded him but he did not let go until the Bāṭinī was killed. Another Ismā'ilī advanced and was killed, and then a third, who was also killed. Saladin rode to his tent, in a state of shock, hardly crediting his escape. His troop was reviewed and those he did not recognize he sent away. Those he knew he confirmed in his service.⁵

He persevered with the siege of A'zāz for thirty-eight days, each day's fighting being more intensive than that of the day before. Many mines were dug and then the defenders submitted and surrendered the castle to him. He took it over on 11 Dhū'l-Hijja [21 June 1176].

[431] Account of Saladin's siege of Aleppo and the peace made with it

After Saladin had taken the castle of A'zāz he set out for Aleppo, where were al-Malik al-Šāliḥ and the troops he had, and descended upon it for a siege on 15 Dhū'l-Hijja [25 June 1176]. The common people took a creditable role in defending the city, in that they prevented Saladin from getting close to the city, because, whenever he advanced for an assault, he and his men met with failure.

⁵ For another vivid account of this assassination attempt which is different in some details, see *Sanā al-barq*, 100–101.

Many were wounded or slain. The people used to make sallies and engage him outside the city, so he gave up assaults and turned to a waiting game.

The year 571 [1175–76] came to an end and in came the year 572 [1176–77], which found him still besieging the city. On 20 Muḥarram⁶ [29 July 1176] envoys were exchanged between them concerning peace. Both sides were willing, because the inhabitants feared a lengthy siege, for they would perhaps grow weak, and Saladin saw that he was unable to approach close to the city and could not engage the defenders, so he also agreed. Terms of peace were settled for all, for al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, Sayf al-Dīn the lord of Mosul, and the lords of Ḥiṣn Kayfā and Mardīn. The terms that were agreed specified that all should cooperate against whoever treacherously broke them.

When the matter was resolved and peace concluded, Saladin withdrew from Aleppo,⁷ after having restored the castle of A'zāz to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ. The latter sent out to Saladin a young sister of his, still a child. Saladin welcomed her with honour and presented her with many gifts. He said to her, 'What do you want?' and she replied, 'The castle of A'zāz', for they had coached her to say that. Saladin surrendered it to her and departed to go to the lands of the Ismā'īlīs.

[432] Account of disturbances at Mecca, the dismissal of its emir and the appointment of another

In Dhū'l-Ḥijja this year [11 June–9 July 1176] there was a fierce battle in Mecca between the Emir of the Pilgrimage Tāshṭakīn and the Emir of Mecca Mukaththir. The caliph had ordered the emir of the Pilgrimage to dismiss Mukaththir and instal his brother Dā'ūd in his place.

This came about as follows. Mukaththir had built a castle on Mt. Abū Qubays. When the pilgrims set out from 'Arafāt they did not stop for the night at Muzdalifa but simply passed by. Neither did they stone the Jamras.⁸ Some of them just threw pebbles at some of them, as they were going by. They camped at Abṭah,⁹ where some of the inhabitants of Mecca came out and fought them. On both sides several men were killed. The pilgrims shouted, 'Let us raid Mecca', and they proceeded to attack the place. The Emir of Mecca Mukaththir¹⁰ fled and went up into the castle which he had built on Mt. Abū Qubays, where he was besieged. He then

⁶ The date leaves little time for negotiations before Saladin's departure (see following note).

⁷ On Friday '10 days left of Muḥarram' = 30 July 1176 (*Sanā al-barq*, 105). Note that *Zubdat al-ḥalab*, iii, 30, dates his departure 16 Muḥarram/25 July – an error for 26 Muḥarram?

⁸ The Jamras are three stone columns at Minā at which the pilgrims throw pebbles as part of the pilgrimage ritual (see *EI*(2), ii, 438).

⁹ An area N.W. of Mecca, roughly midway between Mecca and Minā (Yāqūt, i, 92).

¹⁰ He was Mukaththir ibn 'Isā ibn Fulayta, an Alid of the Hasanid line (see Zambaur, 21).

abandoned it and left Mecca. His brother Dā'ūd took on the office of emir. Many of the pilgrims sacked Mecca, seized a great deal of the goods of the resident merchants and set fire to many houses.

One remarkable thing that happened was that a Greek fire specialist hit a house with a phial of naphtha and set fire to it. It was the property of some orphans and everything within was burnt. He took a second phial to aim at another place but a stone was thrown at him which hit the phial and smashed it. He himself was set on fire. He lingered for three days, tortured by his burns and then died.¹¹

[433] Miscellaneous events

In Ramadān this year there was a total eclipse of the sun. There was a darkness over the earth, so that for a while it was as though it was the darkness of night, and the stars appeared. This happened in the forenoon of Friday 29 Ramadān [11 April 1176].¹² At that time as a youth I was outside Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar with a teacher of mine, one of the ulema, with whom I was studying mathematics. When I witnessed this I was extremely afraid and clung on to him. He comforted me. As he was also a student of astronomy, he said to me, 'Straightaway you will see everything again', and the eclipse passed quickly.

This year the Caliph al-Mustaḍī' bi-Amr Allāh appointed as palace chamberlain Abū Ṭālib Naṣr ibn 'Alī al-Nāqid. In his younger years he had been nicknamed 'Lark' and people began to shout that at him when he appeared in public. The caliph ordered a troop of Turks to ride with him to prevent it, so people gave it up. Just before the Feast¹³ he gave him a robe of honour preparatory to his riding in the procession. A number of people of Baghdad bought a large quantity of larks with the intention of releasing them during the procession when they caught sight of Ibn al-Nāqid. The caliph was informed of this and that the procession would become a laughing-stock, so he dismissed him from office and appointed Ibn al-Mu'aawij.

In Dhū'l-Hijja on the day of the Feast [20 June 1176] rioting broke out in Baghdad between the common people and some Turks, because of the seizing of the camels destined for sacrifice. Several people were killed and much property was plundered. The caliph distributed large sums of money among those whose property had been plundered.

This year there was an earthquake in the lands of the Persians, from the borders

¹¹ Ibn al-Jawzī was told this by a merchant who had been in Mecca; see *Muntazam*, x, 260. The house that was burnt down had provided money for the orphans from pilgrim rents.

¹² A total eclipse is confirmed for this date but it was a Sunday! The chronicler Michael the Syrian mentions the eclipse on '11 Nīsān 1487' (Seleucid era), which 'lasted two hours' (Michel le Syrien, iii, 367).

¹³ This is the Feast of the Sacrifice or the Major Feast (*al-Īd al-Kabīr*) on 10 Dhū'l-Hijja.

of Iraq to beyond Rayy. Large numbers of people perished and many houses were destroyed. The worst of it was in Rayy and Qazwin.¹⁴

[434] In Rabi' II [19 October–16 November 1175] Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, lord of Mosul, appointed as vizier Jalāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī. His father Jamāl al-Dīn had been the [great] vizier of the Atabeg house. His history has already been told and he was celebrated for generosity and beneficence. After Jalāl al-Dīn assumed the office of vizier, his vast competence and perfect knowledge of the routines of the vizierate became plain. He is the author of a famous collection of excellent official letters and state documents. He was generous, learned and kind. When he became vizier he was twenty-five years old.

In Dhū'l-Ḥijja [11 June–9 July 1176] Sayf al-Dīn also appointed as his deputy in the Mosul citadel Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz and entrusted affairs to him. Previously he had entrusted him with authority over the city of Irbil and its dependencies. He was (God have mercy on him) one of the pious emirs and a doer of good; he built many mosques, caravanserais on the highways, bridges over rivers, hospices and other varieties of charitable institutions. He was constant in his almsgiving, lavish in his generosity and just in his governing (God have mercy on him).

This year the caliph arrested 'Imād al-Dīn Ṣandal al-Muqtafawī, the major-domo. In his place he installed Abū'l-Fadl Hibat Allāh ibn 'Alī ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Ṣāhib.¹⁵

In Ramadān [14 March–12 April 1176] Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh ibn Ayyūb, who had conquered Yemen, came to Damascus after he had heard that his brother Saladin had taken it. He was nostalgic for his home and his comrades, so he left Yemen and came to Damascus. On the way he sent to his brother to tell him of his coming. In his letter he wrote the following verses by Ibn al-Munajjim al-Miṣrī:

To Saladin I complain that I am
 Wasting away and longing to see him again,
 Pained by my distance from him, although,
 Were it not for my love for him, I would not bemoan my distant abode.
 Yet I shall surely mount the steed of my resolve to go to him.
 The steed of my love shall carry me with its gallop and lengthening stride.
 [435] I shall continue through the hottest parts of the day,
 By whose heat the heart of the day will burst.
 I shall travel on through the night, when travels neither

¹⁴ *Muntazam*, x, 266, puts the receipt of a similar report in Dhū'l-Qa'da 572/May 1177.

¹⁵ Ṣandal was arrested, with two retainers of his, in Ṣafar/21 August–18 September 1175. Rumour had it that they plotted some mischief; later the caliph's son Abū'l-'Abbās was 'confined' (*Muntazam*, x, 256).

The phantom of the imagination nor the bright lightning flashes.
 I shall send on to him my heart to tell
 That I shall be following soon in my body,
 So that I may witness his most blessed visage
 From whose horizon rises the morning star of happiness.

In Muḥarram [22 July-20 August 1175] Saladin, whose power had grown great because of the Syrian lands he had conquered and because of his defeat of the Mosul army, moved out of Damascus, which gave the Franks and others cause for fear. His intention was to invade their territory, to ravage and raid it. They sent a request for a truce, which he acceded to and agreed terms with them. He then ordered the Egyptian contingents to return to Egypt and to rest until he renewed his request for them. He stipulated that, whenever he sent to summon them, they should not delay. They therefore returned to Egypt and remained there until he summoned them for the war with Sayf al-Dīn, as we shall relate.¹⁶

The following died this year:

Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Asākir al-Baṭā'iḥī, the Koran reader. He had heard and transmitted much Ḥadīth and was an excellent grammarian.¹⁷

Abū Sa'd Muḥammad ibn Sa'īd ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Razzāz in Dhū'l-Hijja [11 June-9 July 1176].¹⁸ He heard and transmitted Ḥadīth and wrote excellent poetry. As an illustration of that, having received a letter from one of his friends who enclosed some verses, he replied:

O one whose favours dispense with those who would number them
 And frustrate the counting of those who would describe their extent.
 I am incapable of showing gratitude for the generosity you have bestowed;
 I have become a slave and in this there is honour for me.
 You have presented a string of verses which are all pearls.
 Every one who strings a necklace falls short of it.
 When you produce a 'house'¹⁹ from it, for us it is
 A palace, and the pearls of its conceits are crenellations above it.
 If I produce a 'house' to attempt to rival it,

¹⁶ In the light of the passage at the beginning of this year, one might expect 'as we have related', and this is what *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 288, does read, so it is probably a simple error.

¹⁷ Ibn al-Jawzī gives his death under the year 572, to be precise, on the eve of Tuesday 28 Sha'bān/1 March 1177 (*Muntaẓam*, x, 267). Was Ibn al-Athīr confused by the fact that Ibn 'Asakir, the author of the *History of Damascus*, died in 571? See *Muntaẓam*, x, 261; *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, i, 313.

¹⁸ Here too Ibn al-Athīr is probably in error. According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 268, Abū Sa'd died in the year 572/June 1177. The same verses are quoted.

¹⁹ In Arabic *bayt* means a house and also a line of poetry, which produces an untranslatable conceit.

I do so but with a ‘house’ whose roof leaks.
It was never my metier nor was I a practitioner;
Yet when I am near him, I gather some fruits.

It is said that his death was in the year 572 [1176–7] and that is the correct date.

How Saladin ravaged the lands of the Ismā‘ilīs

When Saladin left Aleppo, as we have previously related, he moved against the Ismā‘ilīs’ territory in Muḥarram [July 1176] to wage war on them because of what they had done, attacking him and trying to kill him. He ravaged their land, destroying and burning. He besieged the fortress of Maṣyāf, one of their strongest and most impregnable castles. He set up trebuchets and pressed hard on the defenders without any break. Sinān, the leader of the Ismā‘ilīs, sent to Shihāb al-Dīn al-Hārimī, lord of Hama, who was Saladin’s maternal uncle, asking him to mediate, to settle matters and intercede for him, and adding, ‘If you do not, we will kill you and all of Saladin’s family and emirs.’ Shihāb al-Dīn came to Saladin, interceded for them and asked for them to be pardoned. Saladin agreed to this, made peace with them and then departed.

His troops had become tired of the long campaign. Their hands were full of booty from the Mosul army and the plunder of the Ismā‘ilīs’ land and they wanted to return home to rest. He gave them leave and he himself with his troops went to Egypt because he had been away from it for a long time. He had not been able to go there previously as he feared for the land of Syria. However, after he defeated Sayf al-Dīn, besieged Aleppo, took its lands and then made peace, he felt secure for his lands and so went to Egypt.¹ Having arrived there, he gave orders for the construction of a wall around Old Cairo in the thickets and scrub, and around New Cairo [437] and the Citadel which is on the Muqattam Hill. Its circumference was 29,300 cubits in Hāshimī cubits.² Work was still in progress at Saladin’s death.

Account of a Muslim victory over the Franks and also a Frankish victory over the Muslims

Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Muqaddam was the lord of Baalbek. Information came to him that a detachment of Franks had invaded

¹ On his way he met his brother Tūrānshāh at Hama on Tuesday 2 Ṣafar/10 August 1176, arrived at Damascus 17 Ṣafar/15 August and left Friday 4 Rabi‘ I/10 September. He arrived at Cairo Saturday 26 Rabi‘ I/2 October (*Sanā al-barq*, 106–7, 114–15).

² In Hinz, 58, the mean value of the Hāshimī *dhirāt* is 66.5 cm, i.e. a total distance of almost 19.3 km. ‘Imād al-Dīn saw a detailed survey of the various stages of the proposed wall (precise distance 29,302 cubits), the work to be overseen by Bahā’ al-Dīn Qarāqūsh (*Sanā al-barq*, 119). See also Casanova, *Citadelle*, 536–7.

the Biqā‘, part of the district of Baalbek, and carried out a raid there. He moved to meet them and laid an ambush in the scrub and thickets. He fell upon them and killed many and took two hundred men prisoner, whom he sent to Saladin.

Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh, Saladin’s brother, who had conquered Yemen, had arrived in Damascus, as we have mentioned. While there, he heard that a party of Franks had come from their territory into the district of Damascus. He moved to meet them, which he did at ‘Ayn al-Jarr³ in the meadows there. However, he did not stand fast before them, but fled. They seized and made prisoners of all his men, including Sayf al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn al-Salār, a leading member of the Damascus force. This emboldened the Franks who spread far and wide in that region and thus repaired the set-back⁴ that they had been given by Ibn al-Muqaddam.

Account of the rebellion of the lord of Shahrazūr against Sayf al-Dīn and his return to his allegiance

This year the lord of Shahrazūr, Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Buzān, rebelled against Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, whose subject he was and whose authority he was under.

[438] This came about as follows. Mujāhid al-Dīn was the governor of the city of Irbil and there was a strong enmity between him and Ibn Buzān. When Sayf al-Dīn appointed Mujāhid al-Dīn as his deputy in Mosul, Ibn Buzān feared that he might be harmed by him, so he refused to present himself to be at his service. Jalāl al-Dīn, the vizier of Sayf al-Dīn, sent a letter to him, ordering him to return to obedience and warning him of the consequences of disobedience. It is one of the most excellent of letters and the most forceful on this subject. Were it not for the fear of being prolix, I would quote it. One should seek it in his correspondence. After the letter with its envoy had come to him, he hastened to present himself dutifully at Mosul and the difference was resolved.

Account of a ‘deliverance after adversity’⁵ in an historical context

Near Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar is a strong castle, one of the strongest, called Fanak, on the summit of a high hill. It belongs to the Bashnawī Kurds, who have held it for about three hundred years. This year its lord was one of their emirs, whose name was Ibrāhīm. He had a brother called ‘Isā, who had left the castle and was continuously

³ Situated in the Biqā‘ valley on the Beirut–Damascus road, modern ‘Anjar, *EI*(2), i, 787.

⁴ The text’s metaphor is ‘surgical’; ‘they mended the break’.

⁵ This refers to a prose genre, collections of stories concentrating on unexpected escapes from various trials and dangers; in Arabic *al-faraj ba‘d al-shidda*.

striving to take it from his brother Ibrāhīm. One of the men close to Ibrāhīm gave his allegiance to ‘Isā and opened the postern gate at night and let in through it twenty or more of ‘Isā’s men up to the top of the citadel. They seized Ibrāhīm and those with him. He only had with him a handful of his special retainers. There was a keep on a large rock, towering to a great height over the rest of the castle, where the emir, his family and his close followers lived. The rest of the troops were in the castle below the keep.

After they had seized Ibrāhīm, they put him in a closet. One of them struck him on the arm at the shoulder with a sword, but with no effect. When he was put in the closet, two men were set to watch him. The rest climbed onto the roof of the keep, not doubting that the castle was theirs and that resistance was over.

[439] Early the next day Emir ‘Isā arrived to take over the castle but was still on the other side of the Euphrates. The wife of Emir Ibrāhīm was in another closet, where there was a window of heavy iron that looked out on the castle. She pulled it with her hand and it came away. Her husband’s troops in the castle could do nothing but after she had pulled out the grille, she had the idea of letting down a rope to bring the men up to her. However, she only had lengths of clothing material. She tied them one to another and let them down to the castle. She fastened her two [*sic*] ends to a wooden post and ten men climbed up to her. Those on the roof were unable to see them.

Emir ‘Isā on the [further] bank of the Euphrates saw the men climbing up and shouted out, he and the men with him, to those on the roof to beware. As often as they shouted, the defenders of the castle shouted too to make a confusion of voices, to prevent the men on the roof understanding, coming down and putting a stop to it. When ten men had gathered with the wife, she sent a servant of hers to her husband with a glass of sherbet and ordered him to get close to him, as though helping him to drink, and tell him the situation. This he did and sat before him to give him the drink and told him what was happening. The emir said, ‘Increase the number of men’, so she brought up twenty, who then left her closet. Ibrāhīm reached out to the two men guarding him and seized their hair. He ordered the servant to kill them, for he was with him. He killed them with their own weapons. Ibrāhīm left and joined his men. They wanted to open the door to the castle so that [the rest of] his men could come up to him from the castle, but they could not find the keys. They were with the men on the roof. They were therefore forced to climb to the roof of the keep to tackle ‘Isā’s men. The latter realized what was happening, came and stood at the head of the stairway, so that nobody could get up. One of Ibrāhīm’s men took a shield and held it over his head, got on the stairs and climbed up, engaging the persons at the head of the passage, until his comrades climbed up and killed the enemy group. One who was left threw himself from the roof, fell to the bottom of the hill and was broken to pieces. [440] When ‘Isā saw the fate of his men, he withdrew, disappointed of his hopes. Emir Ibrāhīm was re-established in his castle in his former state.

Account of the sack of Bandanījīn

This year the prince who was in Khuzistan with Shumla, namely the son of Malikshāh ibn Maḥmūd, came to Bandanījīn. He ruined and sacked it, massacred the people, enslaved the womenfolk and perpetrated every sort of evil.

The news of this came to Baghdad, so the Vizier ‘Aḍud al-Dīn prepared to march and reviewed the troops. The troops of Ḥilla and Wāsiṭ arrived with Ṭāṣhtakīn, the emir of the Pilgrimage, and Ghuzoglu and they all set out towards the enemy. When he heard of their coming, he abandoned his position and withdrew. He had with him a large band of Turkomans. The troops of Baghdad plundered them and then went home without any order to do so. They were criticized for this and ordered to return to their positions. They did this early in Ramadān [began 3 March 1177]. Meanwhile the prince had returned and seized from Bandanījīn whatever had survived the first sack. There was a battle between the prince and the Baghdad army. Then they disengaged. The prince proceeded to leave Iraq and the Baghdad army went home.

Miscellaneous events

In Jumādā I [November 1176] Friday prayer was performed in the congregational mosque that Fakhr al-Dawla ibn al-Muṭṭalib had built in Ma'mūn's palace in West Baghdad.⁶

This year Saladin gave orders for the construction of the madrasah which is at the tomb of al-Shāfi'i (God be pleased with him) [441] in Old Cairo and he built a hospital in Cairo, on which he settled many substantial endowments.

This year in Mosul I saw two lambs with one stomach, two heads, two necks, two backs and eight legs. They were just like two lambs but with a single stomach. The face of one was opposite the face of the other. This is indeed a wonder.

This year a meteor fell to earth and lit it up with a great light. A great noise was heard from it. Its trail remained in the sky for a while and then went away.

The following died this year:

Tāj al-Dīn Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā', the brother of Vizier 'Aḍud al-Dīn, the caliph's vizier.

The Cadi Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī, cadi of Damascus and all of Syria, in Muḥarram [July 1176].⁷ He controlled the charitable endowments there and the administration. He was generous and learned, a leading statesman of intelligence and understanding of how states are administered (God have mercy on him and be pleased with him).

⁶ The mosque of Ibn al-Muṭṭalib was on the north side of 'Īsā Canal just where it flows into the Tigris (see Le Strange, *Baghdad*, 87 and map IV).

⁷ He died on 6 Muḥarram/15 July 1176 (*Sanā al-barq*, 107).

Account of the defeat of Saladin at Ramla

This year, late in Jumādā I, Saladin marched from Egypt¹ to the Syrian littoral aiming to raid Frankish territory. He assembled large numbers of his standing troops and abundant levies. They continued their march, pressing on with all speed, until they reached Ascalon on 24 Jumādā I [18 November 1177],² which they sacked, making captives, slaughtering and burning. They scattered throughout those regions in raiding parties. When they saw that the Franks did not field an army nor gather any force to protect the lands from the Muslims, they became over eager and relaxed, moving around the country secure and confident.

Saladin came to Ramla,³ intending to attack one of their fortresses and put it under siege. He reached a river and the troops jostled together to cross. The next thing they knew, the Franks were upon them with their battalions and their champions. Saladin only had a part of his army because most of them had dispersed in search of booty. When he saw the Franks, he stood firm with the men he had. Saladin's nephew, Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad, advanced and personally engaged in the fighting before his uncle. Several of his men were killed and the Franks also had losses. Taqī al-Dīn had a son, named Aḥmad, a very handsome youth, just at the time he had first grown a full beard. His father ordered him to charge them. He charged, fought and returned safely, having had a mighty effect on them. Ordered to go back a second time, he charged and met a martyr's death and passed away with much praise (God have mercy on him and be pleased with him).

[443] One who fought the fiercest that day was the Lawyer ‘Īsā (God have mercy on him). The rout of the Muslims was complete. One of the Franks charged Saladin and got close, almost reaching him, but the Frank was killed in front of him. The Franks crowded about him, so he departed in flight, travelling a little and then stopping, to allow the troops to catch up with him, until night fell. He proceeded through the desert until he came with a small body of men to Egypt. On the way they suffered great hardship; food and water was in short supply. Many of

¹ Saladin left Cairo on Friday 3 Jumādā I/28 October 1177 (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 32: *Syrische Blitz*, 280).

² According to ‘Imād al-Dīn on Wednesday 29 Jumādā I/23 November 1177 (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 37: *Syrische Blitz*, 289).

³ On Friday 1 Jumādā II/25 November 1177 (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 37-8: *Syrische Blitz*, 290). The river was below Tell al-Ṣāfiya, while William of Tyre calls the site 'Mons Gisardi'. For a discussion of the location of the battle, see Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 123.

the army's horses perished through hunger and thirst and because of their precipitate flight.

As for the troops who had penetrated Frankish territory as raiders, most of them were lost, either killed or taken prisoner. One of those captured was the Lawyer Īsā al-Hakkārī, a notable member of the Asadiyya, who united learning, piety and courage. His brother, Zāhir al-Dīn, was also taken prisoner. The two of them had joined the rout and lost the way. They were taken along with several of their men. They remained for years in captivity and then Saladin ransomed the Lawyer 'Īsā for 60,000 dinars and a sizeable number of prisoners.

Saladin arrived at Cairo in the middle of Jumādā II [=8 September 1177].⁴ I have seen a letter which Saladin wrote in his own hand to his brother Shams al-Dīn Tūrānshāh at Damascus and which tells of this incident. It begins with this verse:⁵

I remembered you when the Khaṭṭī⁶ spear was quivering between us
And the brown straightened lances had drunk from us.

He says in the letter: 'We were on the point of death more than once. God preserved us (praise be to Him) just for a purpose that He had in mind. "It only holds firm because it has a purpose in view."'⁷

[444] Account of the Franks' siege of the city of Hama

In Jumādā I of this year [November 1177]⁸ the Franks also besieged Hama. This came about because a great count of the Franks,⁹ one of their monstrous devils, came by sea to the Syrian littoral. He saw that Saladin was in Egypt, having returned there in defeat, so he took advantage of the country's empty state, as Shams al-Dawla [Tūrānshāh] ibn Ayyūb, who was in Damascus, acting as lieutenant for Saladin, did not have many troops, and what is more, he was very devoted to his pleasures and inclined to take things easy.¹⁰ This Frankish count gathered the Franks in Syria, distributed money to them and marched to Hama, which he put under siege. The ruler there was Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Ḥārimī,

⁴ 'Imād al-Dīn (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 42; *Syrische Blitz*, 296) specifies 'Thursday'.

⁵ This verse is by Abū 'Aṭā' al-Sindī (see al-Marzūqī, *Sharḥ dīwān al-Hamāsa*, i, 56).

⁶ Khaṭṭ is a toponym that refers to the whole eastern coast of Arabia, where lances from India were imported and bought by the Bedouin (*Yāqūt*, ii, 453–4).

⁷ Saladin quotes al-Mutanabbi, *Dīwān*, 195. 'It' refers to *salāmatī* ('my well-being, my preservation').

⁸ On Sunday 20 Jumādā II/= 13 November (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 52; *Syrische Blitz*, 313).

⁹ This is the Count of Flanders, Philip of Alsace (called Ifland by 'Imād al-Dīn).

¹⁰ In addition, Tūrānshāh, having full authority at Damascus, had paid the Franks not to raid (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 52–3; *Syrische Blitz*, 313–14).

Saladin's maternal uncle, and he was seriously ill. A detachment of Saladin's standing army who were nearby,¹¹ entered the city and gave aid to the defenders.

The Franks attacked the city fiercely. One day they stormed a part of it and almost took the city by force of arms. The inhabitants and the standing army gathered at that side and the battle raged fiercely. It was a crisis point for both sides. The Muslims showed themselves capable and [fought to] protect themselves, their families and their property. They forced the Franks outside the city, where the battle continued night and day. The morale of the Muslims rose when they expelled them from the city. They were sure they would prevail and they killed many of them. At that, the Franks departed, disappointed and God saved the Muslims from their evil. They went to Hārim and besieged it,¹² Their stay at Hama had lasted four days. After the departure of the Franks from Hama, its lord, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Hārimī, died. He had a son, a very handsome youth, who died three days before him.¹³

[445] Account of the killing of Kumushtakīn and the Franks' siege of Hārim

This year al-Malik al-Şāliḥ ibn Nūr al-Dīn arrested Sa'd al-Dīn Kumushtakīn, who had been in charge of the affairs of his reign and the chief authority. His arrest came about as follows. In Aleppo there was a man, a leading citizen, called Abū Şāliḥ ibn al-'Ajāmī, who had been a prominent figure under Nūr al-Dīn and who, after Nūr al-Dīn's death, was also prominent in the reign of his son, al-Malik al-Şāliḥ. He came to have the position of 'great vizier', with a strong grip on affairs because of the large number of his followers in Aleppo and because all who were envious of Kumushtakīn joined [Abū] Şāliḥ. They strengthened his morale and enlarged the body of his supporters. There was boldness and daring in him. Thus he became the sole figure in the regime at Aleppo and the person whose opinions and orders activated most people.

One day when he was in the mosque some Bāṭinīs attacked and killed him. He passed away, a martyr, and when he had gone, Sa'd al-Dīn took control and his position became powerful. After the assassination common opinion laid the murder at Sa'd al-Dīn's door. People said, 'He arranged for him to be killed by the Bāṭinīs'. They spoke of this to al-Malik al-Şāliḥ and charged him with weakness, claiming that he had no authority and that Sa'd al-Dīn dominated, despised and belittled him – and had killed his vizier. They kept on at him, until he finally arrested him.

¹¹ Led by Sayf al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Ahmad al-Mashṭūb (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 53; *Syrische Blitz*, 314).

¹² For four months according to *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 54; *Syrische Blitz*, 316).

¹³ Shihāb al-Dīn died Sunday 11 Jumādā II/4 December 1177. His son was called Tekesh (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 55; *Syrische Blitz*, 317).

The castle of Ḥārim was Sa'd al-Dīn's. He had been given it as a fief by al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ. After his arrest his men there held out and fortified themselves behind its walls. Sa'd al-Dīn was sent there under guard to order his followers to surrender it to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ. He gave this order but they refused to obey. Kumushtakīn was then tortured while his men looked on and showed him no mercy and he died under the torture. His men persisted in their resistance and disobedience.

Aware of this, the Franks moved from Hama to Ḥārim during Jumādā I [26 October–24 November 1177], as we shall relate,¹⁴ thinking that there was nobody to come to their aid, that al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ was a youth with a small army [446] and that Saladin was in Egypt. They grasped this opportunity, descended upon the place and maintained a long siege for a period of four months. They erected trebuchets and scaling ladders and persevered until al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ offered them money. He said to them, 'Saladin will be coming to Syria. Perhaps the defenders of the castle will surrender it to him.' They then agreed to withdraw. When they had done so, al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ sent an army to besiege it. The Franks' siege had brought them to the end of their efforts and they had become as though exhausted.¹⁵ Many of the inhabitants had been killed or wounded. They therefore handed over the castle to al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ, who appointed as his deputy there a mamluke of his father's, called Surkhak.

Miscellaneous events

In Muḥarram of this year [July 1177] the khutbah was made in the name of Sultan Tughril ibn Arslān ibn Tughril ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, who resided at Hamadhan with Īldikiz. His father Arslān had died.

On 7 Shawwāl [29 March 1178] a mighty wind blew at Baghdad and the earth shook. The event terrified the people who thought that the resurrection had arrived. This lasted for an hour and then passed. Many houses had collapsed and a large number of people perished under them.

On 4 Dhū'l-Qa'da [24 April 1178] 'Aḍud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā' Abī'l-Qāsim ibn al-Muslima, the caliph's vizier, was killed. He had intended to go on Pilgrimage

¹⁴ This is a place where, according to the arrangement of material, one should read 'as we have related', although *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 295, has the same reading as the text. This may indicate something about Ibn al-Athīr's working. Perhaps he did not compose in the strict order of the material as it is now and having assembled passages he failed to revise this cross reference.

¹⁵ The text has *talā'i*, which gives no sense. Read *talā'ih*, as in what is clearly the text's source, *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 52: *Syrische Blitz*, 313.

and crossed the Tigris preparatory to setting out.¹⁶ Various officials crossed with him and he was accompanied by a large retinue. He ordered his subordinates that nobody should be kept from him. When he came to the gate of Qaṭuftā, a middle-aged man confronted him and said, 'I am a wronged man'. He came forward so that the vizier could hear what he had to say and then stabbed him in the side with a dagger. The vizier cried out, 'He has slain me', and fell from his horse. He lost [447] his turban and covered his head with his sleeve. The Bāṭinī received a blow from a sword but turned back to the vizier and stabbed him again. The palace chamberlain, Ibn al-Mu'awwaj, advanced to aid the vizier and was stabbed by the Bāṭinī. It is said that he was struck by a comrade who was with the Bāṭinī. Both the latter and his comrade were then killed. They had a third accomplice, who shouted, brandishing a dagger, but he was killed before he could do anything. All three of them were burnt. The vizier was carried to a house he had there. The palace chamberlain was carried, wounded, to his residence. Both he and the vizier died. The vizier was taken away and buried with his father in the Hospice cemetery near the Mosque of al-Mansūr.

The vizier had seen in a dream that he embraced 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān. His son related that before leaving he had performed his ablution and said, 'This is the ablution Islam requires. I am a dead man without any doubt.' He was born in Jumādā I 514 [August 1120]. His father was major-domo of al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh and he took over his position after his death. He continued to hold it until the death of al-Muqtafī. Al-Mustanjid confirmed him in that office and raised his status. When al-Mustaḍī became caliph, he appointed him as vizier. He knew the Koran by heart, was a student of Ḥadīth and did many good works. His residence was a meeting place for the ulema and his good deeds were crowned with martyrdom, while setting out on Pilgrimage.

Thus year there was a disturbance in Baghdad. This was because a group of Muslims from al-Madā'in came to Baghdad and complained about the Jews there. They said, 'We have a mosque where we make the call to prayer and perform our prayers and it is next to the synagogue. The Jews have said to us, "You have caused us nuisance with your frequent call to prayer", to which the muezzin replied, "We do not care about that".' A dispute arose and then an affray followed in which the Jews gained the upper hand. The Muslims came to complain about them but the head of the Storeroom, Ibn al-'Aṭṭār, ordered their imprisonment. They were later released and went to the Palace Mosque, where they raised their cries of protest before the Friday prayer. The preacher shortened the khutbah and the ritual of prayer, but they again shouted their protests. A detachment of troops came and stopped them, but when the common people saw how they had been treated, they became enraged in their zeal to support Islam and raised their voices in complaint,

¹⁶ Ibn al-Athīr adds in *Bāhir*, 179, that he too was in Baghdad at this time, planning a pilgrimage.

uttering many bad things. They removed the tiles¹⁷ and threw them at the troops, who fled. The mob then attacked the shops [448] of the apothecaries, because most of them were Jews, and ransacked them. The palace chamberlain tried to stop them but they stoned him, so he fled too. The city was in turmoil. They ruined the synagogue by the residence of al-Basāsīrī and burnt the Torah. The Jews went into hiding. Then the caliph ordered that the synagogue at al-Madā'in be demolished and converted into a mosque. Scaffolds were erected in the Square for some criminals to be crucified on them. However, the mob thought they had been erected to frighten them on account of what they had done. During the night they hung some dead rats on them. Several thieves were brought from prison and crucified on them.

In Sha'bān [23 January–20 February 1178] Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī, lord of Mosul, arrested his vizier, Jalāl al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Jamāl al-Dīn for no crime, incompetence or shortcoming, but because of Sayf al-Dīn's weakness. There was enmity between Jalāl al-Dīn and Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz. Mujāhid al-Dīn said to Sayf al-Dīn, 'The vizier must be arrested', so he arrested him, although unwillingly. Later Ibn Nīsān, the headman of Āmid, interceded for him because they were relations by marriage. He was released and went to Āmid, where he fell ill. He returned to Dunaysir and died there in 574 [1178–79], aged twenty-seven years. He was carried to the city of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), where he was buried by his father in the hospice that he had built there.

He (God have mercy on him) was one of the ornaments of this world. He united nobility, learning, piety, abstinence and a goodly manner of life. Sayf al-Dīn had made him swear that he would not go to Saladin, as he feared that he might go to him because of the friendship that there had been between Jamāl al-Dīn and both Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb and Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh. I have heard that Saladin did ask for him but he did not go to him because of his oath.

This year a body of Franks attacked the district of Homs and plundered it, taking booty, [449] prisoners and captives. Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shirkūh, lord of Homs, took the field, anticipated them and blocked their route. He laid an ambush and when the Franks arrived, he and the ambushers surprised them and put them to the sword. Most of them were slain and a number of their commanders were taken prisoner. Only those who fled escaped and then only sorely wounded. He recovered all the booty they had taken and returned it to its owners.

In Rabi' II [27 September–25 October 1177] Ṣadaqa ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥaddād died. He is the one who wrote a continuation of the history of Ibn al-Zaghūnī in Baghdad.¹⁸

¹⁷ Are these floor or wall tiles? Note that *Miṣmār*, 88, says that in 578/1182–3 the caliph built a pleasure palace on the Tigris, the first 'furnished with coloured tiles, red, blue and other colours' (*furrishat ṭawābiq mulawwana azraq wa-ahmar wa-sā'ir al-alwān*).

¹⁸ Ibn al-Jawzī writes disapprovingly of Ibn al-Ḥaddād's scepticism and his 'philosophical' views *re* bodily resurrection and predestination. He was born in 479/1086–7, worked as a

In Jumādā I [November 1177] Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār, the Ḥanafī lawyer known as al-Muṣṭab, died in Baghdad.¹⁹

copyist all his life and died Saturday 13 Rabī‘ II/= 8 October 1177 (*Muntazam*, x, 276–8). Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 344–6, gives his birth date as 497/1103–4 and says (surprisingly) that he was a Ḥanbalī and imam of a mosque in Baghdad. Neither source mentions his historical writing. However, al-Ṣafadī mentions his ‘excellent chronicle’ which began from the year of the death of his teacher, al-Zāghūnī, i.e. 527/1132. He also gives his birth year as 477/1084–5 and his death date as 573/1177 (*Wāfi*, xvi, 292–4). Cahen, ‘Historiography’, 62, gives Ibn al-Ḥaddād’s death date as 570/1174 and names his teacher as al-Raghūnī (*sic*).

¹⁹ He was born in 492/1098–9 and died the eve of Tuesday 11 Jumādā I/5 November 1177, but this was a Saturday (*Muntazam*, x, 279).

How the Franks attacked Hama again

This year during Rabī' I [September 1178] a large body of Franks in Syria marched to Hama. They assembled many knights and infantry in their eagerness for plundering and raiding. They launched their raid and plundered and ruined the villages, burning, capturing and killing. When the troops based in Hama heard of this, they moved against them, although they were few in number, trusting in God Almighty. God gave them victory and the Franks were defeated, many of them being killed or taken prisoner.¹ The Muslims recovered what the Franks had seized as booty from the countryside.

Saladin had returned from Egypt to Syria during Shawwāl of the previous year [April 1178]² and he was camping outside Homs. The heads [of the slain] and the prisoners taken, along with what had been seized from them, were brought to him. He ordered the prisoners to be executed and this was done.³

Account of Ibn al-Muqaddam's rebellion against Saladin, the siege of Baalbek and the taking of the city from him

In this year Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Muqaddam rebelled against Saladin in Baalbek. He held it since Saladin had given it to him, after conquering it, as a reward, seeing that [451] Ibn al-Muqaddam had surrendered Damascus to him, according to the account that has been given already. It remained in his hands until this present moment. Shams al-Dawla ibn Ayyūb, Saladin's brother, asked him for Baalbek and persisted in his request because it was where he had been raised and grew up. and so he was very fond of it and preferred it to any other town. He was the elder brother and Saladin was unable to oppose him. He therefore ordered Shams al-Dīn to surrender it to his brother, so that he could give him something in exchange for it. However, Ibn al-Muqaddam did not accept this and reminded him of the undertakings he had been given and that he

¹ According to *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 128, during the first ten days of Rabī' II/16-25 September.

² Saladin left Cairo on Saturday 26 Sha'bān 573/=18 February 1178 and, travelling via ‘Aqabat Ayla, arrived at Damascus Saturday 24 Shawwāl/15 April 1178 (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 56, 58).

³ This was an occasion on which ‘Imād al-Dīn declined the invitation to execute one of the prisoners (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 130-31).

had authorized the handing over of the town to him. Saladin paid no heed to him and was adamant about taking it back. Ibn al-Muqaddam travelled there and fortified himself within.⁴ Saladin came and besieged him there for a while, then withdrew⁵ without having taken it. He left a force to blockade it. After the blockade had continued a long time, Ibn al-Muqaddam sent to Saladin to ask for an exchange to allow him to give up Baalbek. Saladin duly gave him something to replace Baalbek, which he handed back⁶ and which Saladin assigned as a fief to his brother, Shams al-Dawla.

Account of a famine and widespread sickness

This year the rains failed completely in all the lands of Syria, the Jazīra, Iraq, Diyār Bakr, Mosul and the Uplands, Khilāt and elsewhere. Famine became severe and widespread in all the lands. A *ghirāra* of wheat, which is twelve *makkūks* in Mosul measures, was sold in Damascus for twenty old Tyrian dinars. In Mosul barley cost one Amīrī dinar for every three *makkūks*. In all other lands prices were comparable.

[452] The people in all regions of the land prayed for rain but their prayers were not granted. Food became short and people ate carrion and similar things. This situation lasted until the end of 575 [May 1180], but it was followed by severe sickness, also widespread. The mortality rate was high. Everyone had the same illness, namely delirium (*sarsām*). The people could not keep up with burying the dead. However, some places were more badly affected than others. Eventually God Almighty had mercy on His servants, the land and the animals and sent the rains. Prices became cheaper.

One of the things that I saw was that I went to one of the pious ulema in Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] to hear from him some Ḥadīth of the Prophet (blessings be upon him) during the month of Ramaḍān 575 [February 1180] when the people were at their worst stage of the famine and most despairing of the rains. It was the middle of spring and not a single drop of rain had come. While I and several others were sitting, waiting for the Shaykh, a Turkoman approached, with all the signs of hunger on him. He looked as though he had been taken from the tomb. He wept and complained of hunger. I sent someone to buy him some bread. He was a long time bringing it because it could not be found, and meanwhile the Turkoman was

⁴ This confrontation up to roughly this point is recorded under the year 573/1178-9 in *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 92-3 and *Syrische Blitz*, 381.

⁵ To Damascus during the last ten days of Rajab/ 2-11 January 1179, leaving Ṭughril al-Jāndār in charge of the blockading troops (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 139).

⁶ It is tempting to read *wa-tasallamahā* ('and he took it over') rather than the text's *wa-sallamahā* ('and he handed it over'), although *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 298, has that reading. Ibn al-Muqaddam received 'the fortress and lands of Ba'rin, the town of Kafr Ṭāb and villages and estates in lands of Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān' (Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 133).

weeping, writhing on the ground and complaining of hunger. There was not one of us who did not weep in compassion for him and for others. At that very moment the sky clouded over and scattered drops of rain fell. Everyone cried out and raised their voices in prayer. The bread then arrived, the Turkoman ate some of it, took the rest and departed. The rain became heavy and continuous from that moment.

Account of Frankish raids on Muslim territory

In Dhū'l-Qa'da of this year [April 1179] the Franks gathered together and marched towards Damascus with their king. They raided its district, plundering, taking prisoners, killing and enslaving. Saladin sent [453] Farrukhshāh, his nephew, with a body of troops to oppose them. He ordered him that, if he got close to them, he send the news to him by pigeon post, so that he could join him. He also commanded him to order the inhabitants to give way before the Franks' advance. Farrukhshāh left with his force to find them but before he knew what was happening, the Franks were upon him. He was forced to give battle and they fought more fiercely than had ever been seen. Farrukhshāh threw himself upon them, engaging wildly in the battle and not leaving it to others. The Franks were routed and the Muslims won a victory over them.⁷ Several of their nobles were killed, including Humphrey.⁸ How can you be made to realize just what this Humphrey was! His bravery and his skill in battle were proverbial. He was a tribulation that God inflicted on the Muslims and God gave relief from his wickedness. Some others of his sort were slain too and Farrukhshāh's force was less than a thousand mounted men.

Also this year the Prince, lord of Antioch and Lattakia, raided the Muslim horses at pasture at Shayzar and drove them off. The lord of Tripoli raided a large assembly of Turkomans and seized their flocks. Saladin was at Bānyās, as we shall relate, God willing. He sent his nephew, Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar to Hama and his cousin, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shirkūh, to Egypt and ordered both to guard the land and defend its borders against the enemy (may God Almighty destroy them).

Miscellaneous events

On the eve of the middle of Rabī' II [30 September 1178] the moon was eclipsed for about the last third of the night and was hidden from sight.

⁷ On Wednesday 1 Dhū'l-Qa'da/11 April 1179 (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 149).

⁸ i.e. the Constable, Humphrey of Toron. For this confrontation, see Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 136.

This year too, on 29 [Rabī‘ II] [14 October 1178], there was an eclipse of the sun in the evening and it set in that state.

[454] In Sha‘bān of this year [January 1179] the poet Ḥayṣa Bayṣa died.⁹ His name was Sa‘d ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa‘d, Abū'l-Fawāris. He studied Ḥadīth and wrote panegyrics for caliphs, sultans and great magnates. His poetry is celebrated. Here is an example:¹⁰

Whenever I foolishly enlarge [the scope of] my moderation,
Evil report enlarges its slander of it.
When I utter a verse that takes wing,
It outstrips the south and the north winds.
Do not blame me in my struggle with high rank.
Ease of life is for ladies of the bridal pavilions.
A sword of glory is embellished by its own splendour.
By its nature it needs no polishing.

In Muḥarram [July 1178] Shuhda, the calligrapher, daughter of Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Ibarī, died. She heard Ḥadīth from Sirāj al-Dīn, Tīrād and others. She had a long life, approaching 100 years of age. Large numbers of people heard Ḥadīth from her because of the high authority of transmission from her.¹¹

⁹ He died Wednesday 6 Sha‘bān 574/= 10 January 1179 (*Wafayāt*, ii, 362-5; cf. *EI*(2), iii, 327). *Muntaẓam*, x, 288, gives 16 Sha‘bān/27 January 1179 (which was a Saturday!).

¹⁰ Cf. Ḥayṣa Bayṣa, *Dīwān*, i, 147-51. These verses are scattered within a lengthy poem.

¹¹ See above p. [200]. According to *Muntaẓam*, x, 288, she died the eve of Monday 14 Muḥarram/= 3 July 1178 and was known as Fakhr al-Nisā’ (the Pride of Women).

Account of the demolition of the fort that the Franks built at the Ford of Lamentations

The Franks had built a strong fort similar to Bānyās at Jacob's House¹ (blessings be upon him) at a place known as the Ford of Lamentations. When Saladin heard of this, he went from Damascus to Bānyās, where he remained a while and dispatched raids into Frankish territory. He then moved to the fort and camped around it, to gain information about it with the intention of returning there when his troops had concentrated. He later descended on the fort and engaged the Frankish defenders but withdrew again. When the year 575 [1179–80] arrived, he did not leave Bānyās but remained there, while his cavalry raided the enemy's territory.

He sent out a detachment of his troops with foragers but they were taken unawares by the surprise appearance of the Franks with their king. They sent to tell Saladin the news and he set out² with his army, making all speed and came up with them, still engaged in combat. The Franks fought fiercely and made a number of charges against the Muslims, almost driving them from their positions. Then God sent down victory on the Muslims and scattered the polytheists. Great slaughter was done amongst them. Their king escaped quite alone. Many were taken prisoner, including [Baldwin]³ the lord of Ramla and Nablus, the highest ranking Frank after the king. Also taken were the brother of the lord of Jubayl,⁴ the lord of Tiberias,⁵ the Master of the Templars,⁶ the Master of the Hospitallers, the lord of Jinin and other [456] notorious knights and despots.⁷ [Baldwin] ransomed himself for 150,000 Tyrian dinars and the release of 1,000 Muslim prisoners.

Most of what was achieved that day was due to 'Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh,

¹ Otherwise known as Bayt al-Aḥzān (House of Lamentations), it was said to be where Jacob lived in sorrow during the absence of Joseph (Le Strange, *Palestine*, 412). It was near an important crossing of the Jordan (Jacob's Ford) between Huleh and Lake Tiberias. See also *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 144ff.

² On the eve of Sunday 2 Muḥarram/9 June 1179 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 27).

³ The text calls him 'son of Bīzān', this being a version of Barisanus, the latinized name of Baldwin's father, Balian I of Ibelin. Cf. *Sanā al-barq*, 166: Ibn Bārzān Bādwīn.

⁴ Otherwise Giblet or Byblos, on the coast between Beirut and Tripoli (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 64–7).

⁵ Hugh of Galilee, stepson of the Count of Tripoli.

⁶ Odo of Saint-Amand.

⁷ For an account of this battle of Marj 'Uyūn, see William of Tyre, ii, 442–3, where, having mentioned some of the dead by name, he added 'many others whose names I do not know.'

Saladin's nephew. It is related of him that he said, 'I recalled in that crisis the verses of Mutanabbī,⁸ namely:

If powers may be won, then they
 Come to one who faces sudden death
 And one who for a while despises this world for himself,
 When swords resound on the heads of armed warriors.

Death was then as nothing in my eyes and I dashed to meet it.' This was the reason for the victory.

Saladin then returned from the site of the battle to Bānyās and prepared to attack and besiege that fort.⁹ He moved there in Rabī' I [August 1179] and surrounded it. The [Frankish] defeat we have mentioned strengthened his eagerness to overcome it. He sent out his troops to raid Frankish territory, which they duly did and collected a good deal of timber and vine stocks to be used as protective screens for the trebuchets. Jāwulī al-Asadī, the commander of the Asadiyya and a senior emir,¹⁰ said to Saladin, 'The best plan is to try them with an assault straightaway. Let us taste how they fight and see how we are with them. If we find them weak, [well and good]; if otherwise, there is still the option of setting up the trebuchets.' He accepted his advice and gave the order for a vigorous assault. They attacked and the fighting was furious and intense. One of the common people in a ragged shirt climbed the barbican of the fort and fought on the wall when he reached the top. Others of his comrades followed him. They were joined by the troops and the barbican was taken. At that the Franks retired behind the fort's walls to defend themselves and their fort until reinforcements could reach them.

[457] The Franks had gathered at Tiberias. The Muslims pressed on with the attack on the fort, fearing that the Franks might come and force them to raise the siege. Night overtook them and Saladin ordered them to stay overnight within the barbican until the following day. They did so and by the next morning they had mined the fort and deepened the mine.¹¹ They then lit the fires in it and awaited the collapse of the wall, but it did not fall because of its thickness, which was nine *najjārī* cubits,¹² and such a cubit is one and a half [common] cubits. They waited

⁸ al-Mutanabbī, *Dīwān*, 376.

⁹ A full account of the operations is in *Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 175-81.

¹⁰ *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 300, reads: [*min*] *akābir al-umarā'*.

¹¹ This is the reading of the text and of *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 302; in Arabic *wa-'ammaqū al-naqb*, which appears to anticipate the second stage of this mining operation. It is again tempting to read *wa-'allaqū al-naqb*. *Ta'līq* is the technical term for preparing the mine for firing. In *Sanā al-barq*, 169, *ta'līq* was initially ineffectual and *ta'mīq* ('deepening') impossible until the first fires were extinguished.

¹² This so-called 'carpenter's cubit' on average was 77.5 cm (Hinz, 60). The *dhirā' al-'āmma* or 'common cubit' was 54.04 cm (Hinz, 55). This makes the wall about 7 m thick.

for two days but it still did not fall. Saladin ordered the fire in the mine to be extinguished. Water was brought and thrown in and the fires were put out. The sappers started mining again and broke [further] into the wall. They fired the mine and the wall fell on Thursday 6 days left of Rabī‘ I [30 August 1179].

The Muslims made a forced entry into the fort and took the defenders prisoner, while releasing the Muslim captives who were there. Saladin killed many of the Frankish prisoners and sent the rest to Damascus. He remained in his position until he had demolished the fort and razed it to the ground. Previously he had offered the Franks 60,000 Tyrian dinars to demolish without any fighting, but they refused thinking that, if the building remained, it would enable them to control much Muslim territory. As for the Franks who had gathered at Tiberias, when they received the news of its fall, they were much disheartened and dispersed to their lands.

The poets wrote much about this. There are for example the verses of our friend, al-Nashw ibn Nafādha (God have mercy on him):

The destruction of the Franks came speedily.
Now is the time to smash their crosses.
Had the time of their death not been near,
They would not have built their House of Lamentations.

Another example is from ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sā‘atī¹³ of Damascus: [458]

Shall there dwell in the homeland of the prophets a band
That is false in their oaths, while they swear them?
I give you good advice (and advice is a duty of religion):
Leave the House of Jacob, for Joseph has come!¹⁴

Account of a battle between the troops of Saladin and those of Qilij Arslān

This year there was a battle between the troops of Saladin, commanded by his nephew Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar ibn Shāhinshāh ibn Ayyūb, and the troops of Prince Qilij Arslān ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, the lord of Konya and Aqsaray.

This came about because Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Zankī ibn Āqsunqur (God have mercy on him) had formerly taken the fortress of Ra‘bān from Qilij Arslān and it had remained in the hands of Shams al-Dīn ibn al-Muqaddam until this time. Qilij Arslān now had designs on it because al-Malik al-Şāliḥ was in Aleppo,

¹³ Bahā’ al-Dīn Abū'l-Hasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Hardūz, a poet who also followed a military career, was born in Damascus in 553/1158 and died in 604/1207–8 (*Wāfi*, xxii, 7–29).

¹⁴ Joseph (Yūsuf) was, of course, Saladin’s given name.

situated between him and Saladin. He sent men to besiege it and a great host gathered there, said to have been 20,000. Saladin sent Taqī al-Dīn against them with 1,000 horse. He brought them to battle and defeated them and repaired the situation in that region, before returning to Saladin. He therefore was not present with him at the destruction of the fort [at Bayt] al-Aḥzān. He used to boast, saying, 'With a 1,000 warriors I defeated 20,000.'¹⁵

[459] Account of the death of al-Mustaṣī’ bi-Amr Allāh and the accession of al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh

This year on 2 Dhū'l-Qa'da [30 March 1180] died the Imam al-Mustaṣī’ bi-Amr Allāh, Commander of the Faithful Abū Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Mustanjid (may God be pleased with him). His mother was an Armenian *umm walad*, called Tender. His caliphate lasted about seven years and seven months. He was born in the year 536 [1141-42]. He was just, a good ruler of his people and very generous with his money, not striving to take what it was customary to take. With him the people enjoyed general security, comprehensive well-being, contentment and peace. They had never seen his like. He was mild, loath to punish for crimes, loving to pardon and forgive sinners. He lived praised and died blessed (God be pleased with him). His reign was, as has been said:

As though his days through the goodness of his rule
Were seasons of pilgrimage, festivals and Friday prayers.

'Aḍud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā' acted as his vizier until he was killed in Dhū'l-Qa'da 573 [April 1178]. After his murder the commanding figure in the state was Zāhir al-Dīn Abū Bakr Manṣūr ibn Naṣr, known as Ibn al-'Aṭṭār. He was a good man, of excellent conduct and very generous, who gained a strong grip on power. When al-Mustaṣī’ died, Zāhir al-Dīn Ibn al-'Aṭṭār embarked on securing the succession for his son, al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, Commander of the Faithful. When he had been successfully proclaimed, the Major-domo Majd al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl ibn al-Şāhib became the controlling man in the state. On 7 Dhū'l-Qa'da [4 April 1180] Zāhir al-Dīn Ibn al-'Aṭṭār was arrested, put under house arrest, then transferred to the Tāj, where he was fettered and guarded. [The whereabouts of] his deposits and wealth were demanded. On the eve of Wednesday 18 Dhū'l-Qa'da [=16 April 1180] he was brought out dead on a porter's back, secretly. Somebody gave a hint who it was. The mob went wild at this, threw him down from the porter's back, uncovered [460] his private parts, tied a rope to his penis and dragged him about the city. They put in his hand a ladle to represent a pen, dipped it in faeces, saying,

¹⁵ More acceptable numbers (i.e. 800 and 3,000) are given by Ibn Abī Tayy (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iii, 31-2).

'Sign an order for us, your Lordship', among other such disgraceful deeds. Subsequently he was rescued from their hands and buried. This was the way they treated him despite the way he ruled them and respected their money and property.

Envoy were sent far and wide to take the oath of allegiance. Ḡadr al-Dīn, the Chief Shaykh, was sent to Pahlawān, lord of Hamadhan, Isfahan, Rayy and elsewhere, but he refused to take the oath. Ḡadr al-Dīn pressed him and spoke roughly to him, finally saying to his troops at his court, 'This man is owed no obedience by you, as long as he does not recognize the Commander of the Faithful. On the contrary, you must depose him from his ruling position and fight him.' He was compelled to swear the oath and make the khutbah. Raḍī al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī, the professor at the Niẓāmiyya, was sent to Mosul to secure the caliph's recognition. The ruler of Mosul swore the oath and made the khutbah for the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, Commander of the Faithful.

Miscellaneous events

This year a dark black wind blew in the Jazīra lands, in Iraq and elsewhere. It occurred generally throughout the lands from midday until a quarter of the night had passed. It remained so dark that a man could hardly see anyone he was with. I was in Mosul at that time. We prayed the afternoon, evening and late night prayers by supposition and guesswork. People turned to submissiveness, repentance and seeking forgiveness. They thought that the Day of Judgement had arrived. When the first quarter of the night had passed, that darkness and gloom, which had covered the sky, ceased. We looked up and could see the stars. We realized how much of the night had elapsed because there was no further increase in the darkness by any onset of night-time. Everybody [461] who arrived from whatever direction told the same story.

In Dhū'l-Qa'da [April 1180] Shams al-Dawla, Saladin's brother, gave up Baalbek and asked for Alexandria in exchange for it. Saladin acceded to this request and gave Baalbek as a fief to 'Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh, his nephew, who went there, gathered his men and raided Frankish territory, even reaching the castle of Safed, which looks down on Tiberias. He took captives, prisoners and booty and destroyed much, doing mighty deeds amongst the Franks. Shams al-Dawla travelled to Egypt and took up residence in Alexandria.¹⁶ When God

¹⁶ After his wish for Baalbek had caused so much trouble, he only remained there a short time. He travelled to Egypt with troops 'on leave' and many merchants and ordinary travellers (*Sanā al-barq*, 161–2). He left Damascus on Friday 6 days left of Dhū'l-Qa'da/= 25 April 1180. According to 'Imād al-Dīn, Saladin, aware of Syria's difficulties in a year of drought, persuaded him to go with the offer of a larger fief in Egypt (*Barq al-shāmī*, iii, 154).

wishes to gather to himself a man in a certain land, he creates some business to lead him there.¹⁷ It became his place of residence until his death.

This year the mosque, which Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz built outside Mosul towards the gate of the bridge, approached completion. The five daily prayers and the Friday prayer were instituted there. It is one of the most beautiful of mosques.

The following died this year:

Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Ṣūfī, the shaykh of the Zawzanī Hospice. He heard Ḥadīth and used to fast for long periods.

‘Abd al-Ḥaqq ibn ‘Abd al-Khāliq ibn Yūsuf. He heard and transmitted Ḥadīth and was from a family of Ḥadīth scholars.

Cadi ‘Umar ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Khiḍr, Abū'l-Ḥasan al-Dimashqī. He also heard and transmitted Ḥadīth and held the office of cadi of the Harem.

‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Zaydī, a diligent student of Ḥadīth, who left many books in a charitable trust at Baghdad. He was an ascetic, good and pious man.¹⁸

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥamza, Abū ‘Alī al-Aqsāsī,¹⁹ the syndic of the Alids at Kufa. He used frequently to recite:

Many folk,²⁰ in whose characters are
Sores, have been made bright-complexioned.
Money has veiled their ugly side;
You will see, if it goes, what it has veiled.

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm,²¹ known as Ibn Sadīd al-Dawla al-Anbārī, the clerk of the Chancery who followed his father.

Abū'l-Futūḥ Naṣr ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Dāmghānī, the lawyer. He was one of the best at legal disputations and very pious. He was buried at the tomb of Abū Ḥanīfa.

¹⁷ This brings to mind the 'appointment in Samarra' story.

¹⁸ Born 529/1134-5 and died Shawwāl this year/March 1180 (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 356-7).

¹⁹ Quṭb al-Dīn Abū Ya'lā Muḥammad, from Aqsās, 'a large village near Kufa' (*Ansāb*, i, 330-31), where he was born in 497/1103-4 (*Wāfi*, iv, 155-6).

²⁰ This is reading *rubba qawmin*, as in *Wāfi*, iv, 156, rather than *Kāmil's rabbi qawwim*.

²¹ Born 507/1113-14 and died Dhū'l-Qa'da this year/April 1180 (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 358).

Account of the death of Sayf al-Dīn, lord of Mosul and the succession of his brother, ‘Izz al-Dīn

On 3 Ṣafar this year [= 29 June 1180]¹ Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, lord of Mosul and the Jazīra, died. He had been chronically ill with consumption. At his end he was overcome with delirium (*sarsām*) and died.

A strange thing to tell is that in the year 575 [1179–80] people came forth to pray for rain because of the drought and severe famine and Sayf al-Dīn also did so, accompanied by his retinue. The people rose against him and targeted him with their protests. They demanded that he order the prohibition of the selling of wine. He agreed, so they entered the city and attacked the houses of the winesellers. They broke down their doors, entered and ransacked them, pouring away the wines they contained and smashing the containers. They [also] did things that were illicit. The owners of the houses appealed for help from the agents of the ruling authority and singled out for complaint a man of righteousness, called Abū'l-Faraj al-Daqqāq, although he had no hand in the ravages effected by the mob and their unacceptable actions. He merely poured away the wine and had ordered the mob to stop what they were doing. When the wine merchants complained of him, he was summoned to the citadel and beaten on his head, so that his turban fell off. When he was released to go down from the citadel, he went with his head uncovered. They wanted to cover his head with his turban but he refused and said, ‘By God, I shall not cover my head until God revenges me on those who have wronged me.’ No more than a few days passed before the death of the castellan [463] who had supervised his punishment and then, following on that, Sayf al-Dīn fell ill and remained so until he died.

He was then about thirty years old. His period of rule had been ten years and three months. He was a handsome man, pleasantly youthful, of full stature and white in complexion. He was intelligent and staid, seldom looking around and about when he either rode out or was in session, and of pure morals. Nothing was ever told of him which would contradict his moral purity. He was extremely jealous of his honour; only his young servants would enter his chambers. Once any of them grew up he would be banned. He did not like to shed blood nor to seize property, despite a certain avarice in him.²

¹ Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 364 and *Wafayāt*, iv, 5, both specify ‘Sunday’.

² The text in *Kāmil* adds ‘and cowardice’ (*wa-jubn*). The sense of this is not clear and the words are neither quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iii, 62 nor do they appear in *Bāhir*, 180.

When his illness became serious, he wished to designate as successor his son, Mu'izz al-Dīn Sanjar Shāh, who was then twelve years old. However, he feared the results of this for the dynasty because Saladin had gained control of Syria and his position had become strong and his own brother, 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn Mawdūd, refused to accept and agree to it. The senior emirs and Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz advised that he should make his successor his brother 'Izz al-Dīn because of his older years, his bravery, intelligence and strong mind and that he should give his two sons some lands and that they should both defer to their uncle 'Izz al-Dīn and their regent Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz. Following this advice, he assigned the succession to his brother and gave Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar and its castles to his son Sanjar Shāh and the castle of 'Aqr al-Ḥumaydiyya to his young son Nāṣir al-Dīn Kabak.³ When Sayf al-Dīn died, his brother 'Izz al-Dīn duly became ruler over Mosul and its lands after him. The controlling power in the state was Mujāhid al-Dīn, the authority in everything. Matters were settled thus and no two persons disagreed.

[464] Account of Saladin's march to make war on Qilij Arslān

This year Saladin marched from Syria to the lands of Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, namely Malatya, Siwas with all between them, and Konya, to make war on him.

This came about because Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā'ūd, lord of Ḥisn Kayfā and also parts of Diyār Bakr, had married the daughter of Qilij Arslān, who remained with him for a while. Then he fell in love with a singing girl, whom he married and showed preference for. She exercised authority over his land and his treasury, while he meanwhile neglected Qilij Arslān's daughter and left her forgotten and abandoned. News of this reached her father and he determined to attack Nūr al-Dīn and take his lands. Nūr al-Dīn sent to Saladin to ask for protection and to request him to defend him against Qilij Arslān. Saladin wrote to Qilij Arslān on the matter, who replied, 'I ceded to Nūr al-Dīn a number of fortresses adjacent to his lands when he married my daughter. Since the situation has now come to the state you know about, I want him to give back what he received from me.'

Messengers went to and fro between them but there was no settlement of the matter. Saladin made a truce with the Franks and marched out with his troops. Al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā'īl ibn Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd was ruling in Aleppo, so he left it on his left hand and marched by Tell Bāshir to Ra'bān, where Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad came and joined him. When Qilij Arslān heard that he was close by, he sent his senior emir to him, saying, 'This man has done such-and-such to my daughter. It is imperative to attack his lands and teach him his position.' After the

³ The text has Kasak. His personal name is not given in other sources.

envoy had arrived, he met [465] with Saladin and delivered his message. Saladin became furiously angry and said to the envoy, ‘Say to your master, “By God, besides whom there is no other god, if he does not retire, I shall set out for Malatya, which is two days’ march away, and only when I am in the town shall I dismount from my horse. Then I shall attack all his lands and take them from him.”’ The envoy recognized a serious situation. He rose and left Saladin. He had seen his army, its strength and brave array, the quantity of its weapons and mounts and such like. He had nothing to match it. He realized that, if Saladin attacked them, he would take their lands. The next day he sent asking for a meeting. He was summoned and said to Saladin, ‘I wish to say something on my own initiative, which is not a communication from my master.’ ‘Speak,’ said Saladin. He went on, ‘My lord, is it not bad for such as you, one of the greatest and most powerful of sultans, that people should hear it said of you that you have made peace with the Franks, abandoned the holy war and the interests of the kingdom, turned away from everything in which lies salvation for you, your subjects and the Muslims at large, gathered troops from regions far and near, taken the field and spent vast sums, both you and your troops, for the sake of a harlot singing girl? What will be your excuse before God Almighty, the caliph, the princes of Islam and all the world? Grant that no one is confronting you with this, but do they not know that this is how the matter is? Suppose that Qilij Arslān had died and that it is his daughter who has sent to you asking for protection and requesting you to procure her justice from her husband. If she did so, the expectation is that you would not reject her.’

Saladin said, ‘By God, the truth is with you. The matter is as you say, but this man came to me, relied on me and it is bad for me to desert him. You meet him and settle the situation between you as you wish. I will help you with him and censure him for what he has done.’ He made him every fair promise, so the envoy met with the lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]. They discussed the matter between them and then it was settled [466] that the lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā] should dismiss the singing girl in a year’s time. If he failed to do so, Saladin would no longer support him, rather he and Qilij Arslān would both be against him. They agreed on these terms and Saladin withdrew to Syria. Nūr al-Dīn returned to his lands and after the period had elapsed he dismissed the singing girl, who went to Baghdad and remained there until she died.

How Saladin invaded the lands of the son of Leon the Armenian

This year Saladin invaded the lands of the son of Leon the Armenian⁴ after he had settled the affair with Qilij Arslān. This came about because the son of Leon the

⁴ By this is meant Roupen III.

Armenian had won over a group of Turkomans, offered them guarantees of security and told them to pasture their flocks in his land, which is a strong land, all impregnable fortresses, and access to which is difficult, because of its narrow passes and rugged mountains. Later he betrayed them, captured their womenfolk and seized their flocks. He made their men prisoners after he had killed those whose time had come.

Saladin camped at the Black River and sent his raiding parties through the land. Leon's son feared that a fortress of his on a mountain top might be taken, so he demolished and set fire to it. Saladin heard of this and hastened to march there. He reached it before the stores and provisions within could be carried away. He seized it all as booty and the Muslims benefited from what had been taken. Leon's son sent offering to free the prisoners and captives he held and to restore their property on condition that they would retire. This was agreed [467] by Saladin and terms were settled. The prisoners were released and the property returned and Saladin withdrew in Jumādā II [22 October-19 November 1180].⁵

Account of Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn’s conquest of Gafsa after its lord had rebelled against him

In this year Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn came to Ifrīqiya and took Gafsa. This came about because, when the ruler ‘Alī ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn al-Mu‘tazz saw the Turks’ entry into Ifrīqiya, their conquest of part of it and the Arabs’ submission to them, he also became ambitious for power, to be independent of Yūsuf, whose subject he was. He therefore revealed what was in his heart, rebelled and showed open defiance. The inhabitants of Gafsa came to an agreement with him and killed all the Almohads, the followers of Abū Ya‘qūb, in their midst. This was in Shawwāl of the year 572 [April 1177].

The governor of Bougie sent to Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn to tell him of the disturbed nature of affairs, that many Arabs had joined with Qarāqūsh the Turk, who had entered Ifrīqiya, as we have already related,⁶ and [to tell] of the killing of the Almohads in Gafsa and the assistance given by the inhabitants to their lord to do that. Yūsuf began to secure the frontiers for which he would have anxieties after his departure. When he had finished all that, the army made its preparations and he departed for Ifrīqiya in the year 575 [1179-80]. He descended upon Gafsa and besieged it for three months, a strong city whose people were stout fighters, and he cut down the trees around it. When the situation had become critical for its lord and the people, the former left in disguise, unbeknown [468] to any of the inhabitants or his army. He went to Yūsuf’s tent. The chamberlain went in and

⁵ Saladin came to Hama, then to Homs, in the middle third of Jumādā II/1-10 November 1180 (*Sanā‘ al-barq*, 177).

⁶ See above p. [389].

informed Yūsuf that the lord of Gafsa had come to the door of his tent. He was astonished that he dared to present himself without a guarantee but ordered him to be admitted. He entered and kissed his hand, saying, ‘I have come to seek the pardon of the Commander of the Faithful for myself and the people of my city and to ask him to do what is worthy of him’, and he made his excuses. Yūsuf took pity and pardoned him and the citizens. He took over the city at the beginning of 576 [began May 1180] and sent ‘Alī ibn al-Mu‘izz, its lord, to the Maghrib, where he was honoured and respected and given a large area as a fief. Yūsuf stationed a body of his Almohad followers in Gafsa.

Mas‘ūd ibn Zimām, the emir of the Arabs, also presented himself before Yūsuf, who pardoned him and sent him to Marrakech. Yūsuf went to Mahdiyya, where the envoy of the king of the Franks, the ruler of Sicily, came to him, requesting peace. He made a truce with him for ten years. The land of Ifriqiya was stricken by drought and it was impossible to find food for the army and fodder for the animals, so he returned speedily to the Maghrib. God knows best!

Miscellaneous events

In this year Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh ibn Ayyūb, Saladin’s oldest brother, died in Alexandria. He had received it as a fief from his brother and stayed there until his death. He possessed most of the land of Yemen and his lieutenants there used to bring him money from Zabīd and Aden and the lands of fortresses lying between them. He was the most generous and open-handed of men, [469] disbursing all the money of Yemen that used to be brought to him. He came to Alexandria, when his authority over Saladin’s lands and wealth was effective but despite this, when he died, he owed debts of 200,000 Egyptian dinars. When he came to Egypt, his brother Saladin discharged them for him, for, having heard the news of his death, he had travelled to Egypt in Sha‘bān of this year [January 1181],⁷ leaving as his deputy in Syria ‘Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh, the son of his [other] brother Shāhinshāh, who was wise, determined and brave.

Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Salfā al-İsfahānī died this year in Alexandria. He was a student of Ḥadīth, in which he was very learned, and he voyaged in pursuit of a great deal of it.⁸

⁷ Tūrānshāh had died in Muḥarram 576/27 May–25 June 1180. Saladin set out for Egypt Monday 18 Rajab/= 8 December and arrived in Cairo via ‘Aqabat Ayla on 13 Sha‘bān/1 January 1181 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 64, 69; *Sanā al-baqṣ*, 178 and 181–2).

⁸ He was born in 470/1077–8, and travelled extensively (barefoot, it seems). He came to Baghdad in 500/1106–7, to Damascus in 509/1115–16, before settling in Egypt, where Saladin and his brothers visited and heard Ḥadīth from him. He died on Friday 5 Rabī‘ II/= 29 August 1180, ‘aged 105 [lunar] years’ (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 361–2).

In Muḥarram [27 May–25 June 1180] at Baghdad there also died ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-Rahīm, known as Ibn al-‘Aṣṣār, the philologist.⁹ He also heard Ḥadīth and was one of the followers of Ibn al-Jawālīqī.¹⁰

⁹ Born 508/1114–15, he was also a successful merchant, who travelled much to Egypt (*Wāfi*, xxi, 232–3).

¹⁰ i.e. Abū Manṣūr Mawhūb ibn Aḥmad, born 466/1073 and died Muḥarram 539/July 1144, a notable Baghdadi scholar of Arabic language, dedicated to preserving its purity. For editions of his works etc., see *EI*(2), ii, 490.

Account of the raid from Syria on Kerak territory

This year Farrukhshāh, Saladin's deputy in Damascus, went to the district of Kerak and plundered it. The reason for this was that Prince Reynald, lord of Kerak, one of the most devilish and recalcitrant Franks and the most hostile to the Muslims, had prepared for a campaign, gathered his troops and all he could assemble and determined to march overland to Taymā¹ and from there to [Medina] the city of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) to gain control of those august regions. 'Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh heard of this, gathered the troops of Damascus and moved against Reynald's land, which he plundered and laid waste to, and then withdrew to the border of their lands where he remained to defend Muslim territory from the prince. For this reason the latter was unable to do what he intended. After each had remained for a long time face to face with the other, the prince realized that the Muslims would not retire until he disbanded his assembled forces. This he proceeded to do and gave up his ambition to carry out his campaign. Farrukhshāh then returned to Damascus and thus God saved the Muslims from the infidels' evil plan.

[471] Account of the sort of false representation one ought to guard against

Sayf al-Dawla Mubārak ibn Kāmil ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī was the deputy of Shams al-Dawla, Saladin's brother, in Yemen. He had full authority over finances and the region after Shams al-Dawla had left Yemen, as we have mentioned. He longed for Syria, because it was his homeland, so he sent to Shams al-Dawla to request permission to come to him. When permission was granted, he appointed as his deputy in Zabīd his brother, Ḥiṭṭān ibn Kāmil ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī, returned to Shams al-Dawla and joined him in Egypt. After Shams al-Dawla died, he remained with Saladin and then it was claimed of him that he had taken the wealth of Yemen and hidden it away. His enemies spread the slander about him but Saladin did not turn against him.

When this year came and while Saladin was in Egypt, Sayf al-Dawla gave a banquet and invited many people. He invited the notables of Saladin's regime to a

¹ Situated 70 miles from Medain Salih, 'an ancient oasis settlement of northwestern Arabia, now in Saudi Arabia' (*EI*(2), x, 401-2).

feast at a village called al-‘Adawiyya.² He sent his men to make preparation in the town and to buy all the food and other items that were needed. Saladin was told, ‘Ibn Munqidh is planning to flee. His men are buying provisions for him. When he enters Yemen, he will remove it from your allegiance.’ Saladin sent to arrest him and his people, and imprisoned him.³ When Saladin heard the full story, he realised that his enemies had successfully plotted to have him arrested. He moderated his attitude towards him, smoothed over the situation and placated him with 80,000 Egyptian dinars, apart from what was added to that in gifts from Saladin’s brothers and followers. Saladin released him and restored him to his position. Sayf al-Dawla was a literary man and a poet.

[472] Account of Saladin’s sending troops to Yemen

During this year Saladin sent a number of his emirs, including Ṣārim al-Dīn Qutlugh-Aba, governor of Old Cairo, to Yemen, because of the dispute that had broken out between the lieutenants of his brother Shams al-Dawla, that is to say, ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Uthmān ibn al-Zanjīlī, governor of Aden, Ḥiṭṭān [ibn Kāmil] ibn Munqidh, governor of Zabīd, and others. When they heard of the death of their lord, they had fallen out and there was a battle between ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Uthmān and Ḥiṭṭān. Each one wanted to seize what was in the hands of the other. The situation became serious and Saladin feared that the local people might be encouraged because of the differences between his men and that they might expel them from the land. He therefore sent these emirs. Qutlugh-Aba took control of Zabīd and removed Ḥiṭṭān. Later Qutlugh-Aba died, so Ḥiṭṭān returned to be emir of Zabīd, obeyed by the people because of his liberality and bravery.

Account of the death of al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ and how his cousin, ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd, took power in the city of Aleppo

In Rajab⁴ this year [December 1181] al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘il ibn Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, lord of Aleppo, died there, aged nineteen years. When his illness became critical, the doctors prescribed wine for medicinal purposes. He said, ‘I will not do that until I ask for a legal opinion from the lawyers.’ So he consulted them and one, a Ḥanafī professor, declared it permissible. Ismā‘il said to him, ‘See here! if God

² A small settlement (*balada*) on the Nile bank near Birkat al-Habash, south of Cairo (Ibn Duqmāq, 43).

³ Imād al-Dīn was a guest at this banquet at al-‘Adawiyya, which Mubārak had bought from Saladin, and gives a vivid account of the sudden arrival of Bahā’ al-Dīn Qarāqūsh to arrest the host and of the sequel (*Sanā al-barq*, 189–91).

⁴ On 25 Rajab/4 December 1181 (Bahā’ al-Dīn, 55; Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 367).

Almighty has decreed [473] that my end is imminent, will a draught of wine delay it?" to which the lawyer answered, 'No'. 'By God,' he continued, 'I shall not meet God, when I have made use of what he has forbidden me', and he would not drink it.⁵

When he had given up all hope, he summoned the emirs and all the troops and enjoined them to deliver the city to his cousin, 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, and made them swear to that. One of them said, 'Imād al-Dīn is also your cousin and the husband of your sister. Your father loved and preferred him and was in charge of his upbringing. He has nothing but Sinjār. If you gave him the city, that would be better, since 'Izz al-Dīn holds lands from the Euphrates up to Hamadhan. He does not need your lands.' He replied, 'This did not escape me but you are aware that Saladin has taken the whole of Syria except for what I hold. If I hand Aleppo over to 'Imād al-Dīn, he will be unable to keep it and if Saladin conquers it, there will be no place left for our family to resist him. If I give it to 'Izz al-Dīn, he will be able to hold on to it with his large armies and lands.' They approved of what he said and marvelled at his good sense despite his severe illness and young years.

Then he died. He was mild and generous, chaste in hand, private parts and tongue. He was constant in his religious practices; it was never known of him that he indulged in what princes and youths do such as drinking wine and such like. He ruled his people well and was just with them.

After he had passed away, the emirs sent to Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn to summon him to Aleppo. He and Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz set out for the Euphrates and asked the emirs to come to him from Aleppo. They joined him and all proceeded together to Aleppo, which he entered on 20 Sha'bān [29 December 1181]. [474] At that time Saladin was in Egypt. Had that not been so, he would have challenged them for it and fought them. When 'Izz al-Dīn on his way to Aleppo crossed the Euphrates, Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar, Saladin's nephew, was in the city of Manbij. He left in flight for Hama, where the inhabitants rose up and proclaimed the slogan of 'Izz al-Dīn. The Aleppan troops advised 'Izz al-Dīn to attack Damascus and encouraged him to seize it and other Syrian towns, informing him of the people's love for him and his house. He refused, saying, 'There is an oath between us and we shall not act treacherously towards him.' For several months he remained in Aleppo, then left and went to Raqqā.

⁵ Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 366–7, quotes this passage from *Kāmil* but adds that Shāfi'iis were also consulted and allowed wine in such a case. The Ḥanafi is named as 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Kāshānī (also in *Bāhir*, 181–2) but he is said to be mistaken, since the Ḥanafi, Mālikī and Ḥanbalī schools do not allow it.

Account of the cession of Aleppo to ‘Imād al-Dīn and the taking of Sinjār in exchange

After ‘Izz al-Dīn had arrived at Raqqā, envoys of his brother, ‘Imād al-Dīn the lord of Sinjār, came to him, requesting that he surrender Aleppo to him and take the city of Sinjār in exchange for it. He did not agree to this but ‘Imād al-Dīn insisted and said, ‘Surrender Aleppo to me, otherwise I myself shall surrender Sinjār to Saladin.’ At that a group of emirs advised that he hand it over to him. The keenest for that was Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz whom ‘Izz al-Dīn was unable to oppose because of his firm grip on power in the state and his large forces and lands. It was his fear of ‘Izz al-Dīn that persuaded Mujāhid al-Dīn to take that course because the former had grown greater in his own estimation and his army was increasing. The Aleppan emirs used not to defer to Mujāhid al-Dīn nor behave as respectfully towards him as the troops of Mosul did. It was settled that Aleppo should be surrendered to ‘Imād al-Dīn [475] and Sinjār taken in exchange for it. ‘Imād al-Dīn set out to take it over and gave Sinjār to his brother who returned to Mosul.

Saladin had heard in Egypt the news of ‘Izz al-Dīn’s coming to power in Aleppo. He was distressed at this and feared that he might march from there to Damascus and other places and conquer all. He gave up all hope for Aleppo. Then, when he heard the news that ‘Imād al-Dīn had taken control, he set out immediately and marched to Syria. There followed the weakening of ‘Izz al-Dīn’s state, which we will tell of, God willing.

Account of the lord of Mardīn’s siege of the castle of al-Bīra and its lord’s alliance with Saladin

The castle of al-Bīra, which is in the Jazīra, overlooking the Euphrates, was held by Shihāb al-Dīn the Artuqid, the cousin of Quṭb al-Dīn Īlghāzī ibn Alpī ibn Timurtāsh ibn Īlghāzī ibn Artuq, lord of Mardīn, who was a subject of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, lord of Syria. This Shihāb al-Dīn died⁶ and after him the castle was ruled by his son,⁷ who became a subject of ‘Izz al-Dīn Maṣ‘ūd, lord of Mosul.

When this present year came, the lord of Mardīn sent to ‘Izz al-Dīn to ask for permission to besiege al-Bīra and take it. Permission was given, so he marched with his army to the castle of Sumaysāṭ, which was his, stopped there and sent his army on to al-Bīra, which was put under siege. [476] He gained no success there, yet they persevered with the siege. Its ruler sent to Saladin, who had left Egypt, as we shall mention, asking him to assist and force the army of Mardīn to withdraw, [promising] to be at his service, just as his father had been in Nūr al-Dīn’s service. Saladin agreed and dispatched an envoy to intercede with the ruler of Mardīn and

⁶ Shihāb al-Dīn Ilyās ibn Īlghāzī died in 570/1174-5 (*Rawdatayn*, ii, 389).

⁷ His son and successor was Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad.

request him to withdraw his forces. However, he did not accept this intercession. Saladin was occupied with the Franks, as we shall relate. Nevertheless, when the lord of Mardīn saw how long his troops remained at al-Bīra and that they achieved nothing there, he ordered them to retire and returned to Mardīn. The ruler of al-Bīra went to Saladin and stayed with him until they both crossed the Euphrates, as we shall narrate, God willing.

Miscellaneous events

During this year there was much sinful behaviour in Baghdad. The palace chamberlain set up a group to pour away intoxicating drinks and to arrest loose women. While a woman of that class was in a certain place, she realized that the palace chamberlain's men were coming, so she lay down, pretending that she was ill, and raised a moan. They saw her in that state, left her alone and departed. After they had gone she tried to get up, but could not. She began to cry out, 'O woe, O woe!' until she expired. This is one of the strangest tales to be told.

The following died this year:

Emir Humām al-Dīn Tatar on 10 Dhū'l-Ḥijja [16 April 1182] at Muzdalifa. He was the lord of the castle of [477] Takrīt. He had appointed as his deputy Emir 'Isā, nephew of Mawdūd, and departed on pilgrimage. He passed away and was buried in al-Ma'lā, the cemetery of Mecca.

'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Sa'īd, Abū'l-Barakāt, the grammarian, known as Ibn al-Anbārī, in Sha'bān [December 1181] at Baghdad. He is the author of some excellent works on grammar and was a righteous, learned man.⁸

Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Mahrān, the Shāfi'i lawyer, at Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar. He was a learned man of great piety.

⁸ According to Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 368, he died on Thursday 9 Sha'bān/= 17 December 1181.

Account of Saladin's march to Syria and his raid on the Franks

On 5 Muḥarram this year [11 May 1182] Saladin left Egypt for Syria. Here is a surprising tale of an inauspicious remark. When he had moved out of Cairo, he camped in his tent until his troops and his staff, his leading advisors, the ulema and the poets and litterateurs had gathered, some of them to see him off and others to travel with him. Each one of them had something to say about farewell and parting and the expedition that they were embarked upon. One of those present was a tutor of one of Saladin's children. He raised his head from among the gathering and recited:

Enjoy the sweet-smelling ox-eye of Najd,
For after this evening there is no scent.

Having been in a relaxed mood Saladin now became depressed and drew a bad omen [from these words]. The assembly turned sour for those present. Until the day he died, although it was a long time off, he never returned to Egypt.

Saladin then set out from Egypt, followed by a large host of merchants, locals and those who had gone to Egypt from Syria because of the famine there and elsewhere. When he set out, he took his route via Ayla. He heard that the Franks had gathered to oppose him and block his passage. On arriving close to their territory he sent on the weak and the baggage with his brother Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī to Damascus and himself remained just with the fighting troops. He launched raids on their outlying territory and concentrated [479] on the regions of Kerak and Shawbak. Nobody emerged to meet him; no one dared to approach him. Then he continued his march and came to Damascus, which he reached on 11 Ṣafar [16 June 1182].

Account of the Muslims' taking a cave fortress from the Franks

This year also, in Ṣafar [6 June-4 July 1182], the Muslims conquered from the Franks a cave fortress in Syria, known as Habis Jaldak.¹ It was in the district of

¹ It was formed of layers of caves carved out of a precipice overlooking a tributary valley of the Yarmuk river about 14 miles east of Lake Tiberias. See Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 52-54.

Tiberias, overlooking the Sawād.² Its capture came about as follows. When the Franks heard of Saladin's march from Egypt into Syria, they gathered to oppose him, called up their cavalry and infantry and assembled at Kerak, near to his route in the hope that they might seize some opportunity or win a victory. They might possibly prevent the Muslims' passage by stationing themselves in some of the narrows. When they did this, their territory facing Damascus was left empty. Farrukhshāh heard of this, gathered the forces of Damascus he had with him, then marched into Frankish lands and raided them. He plundered Dabūriyya³ and neighbouring villages, taking or killing many men, enslaving the women and seizing booty. He conquered this rock fortress from them. It had been a source of serious harm for the Muslims, who rejoiced greatly at its fall. Farrukhshāh sent a report of the success to Saladin and then met him on the road. This weakened the Franks' power and their offensive potential was broken.

[480] Account of the sending of Sayf al-Islām to Yemen and his taking power there

During this year Saladin sent his brother Sayf al-Islām Ṭughtakīn to Yemen and ordered him to take power there and stop dissensions, entrusting him with its affairs. Ḥiṭṭān ibn Munqidh was [in charge] there, as we have mentioned previously. ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Uthmān al-Zanjīlī, the governor of Aden, wrote to Saladin to tell him of the disturbed state of the country and advise him to send one of his family, because Ḥiṭṭān was too powerful for him and he was fearful of him. So Saladin equipped his brother Sayf al-Islām and sent him off to Yemen. He came to Zabīd and Ḥiṭṭān ibn Munqidh, in fear of him and apprehensive, fortified himself in one of his castles. Sayf al-Islām continued to offer him guarantees, give him presents and show him friendship until he came to him in person. Sayf al-Islām treated him well and behaved with a kindness that he had not expected. However, Ḥiṭṭān did not trust him and asked him for leave to depart to Syria. He declined to grant this, pretending a desire to have him with him. Ḥiṭṭān continued to press him until permission was given. He moved out his baggage, his money, his mounts, his family and retainers, all that he had, and dispatched it all before him.

On the following day he visited Sayf al-Islām to take his leave and was arrested. All his property was brought back and seized, every last item; not a thing, great or small, escaped. He was imprisoned in a certain castle and that was the last that was heard of him. It is said that he was put to death. Among the property that was taken was gold coin that filled seventy iron-bound chests.

As for ‘Izz al-Dīn ‘Uthmān al-Zanjīlī, when he heard what had happened to Ḥiṭṭān, he was fearful and set out for Syria, apprehensively and vigilantly. He sent

² The fertile area known to the Franks as the land of Suhite.

³ Situated below Mt Tabor to the west.

most of his belongings by sea but [his men] were intercepted by ships [481] manned by Sayf al-Islām's men, who seized all 'Izz al-Dīn's possessions. He was left only with what he had taken with him on the road. Zabīd, Aden and associated lands came under the undisputed control of Sayf al-Islām.

Account of Saladin's raid on the Jordan depression and other Frankish territory

After Saladin had come to Damascus, as we have related, he remained for some days to rest and repose, he and his troops. Then in Rabī' I [July 1182] he marched into Frankish territory and made for Tiberias, in the vicinity of which he camped. He pitched his tents at Uqhuwāna on the Jordan. The Franks arrived with their detachments and stopped at Tiberias. Saladin sent Farrukhshāh, his nephew, to Baysan, which he entered by force of arms and plundered thoroughly, killing and enslaving. He swept through the Jordan depression with a far-reaching raid, which spread death and captivity over the inhabitants. The Bedouin arrived and raided Jinin, Lajjūn and that region, even approaching the plain of Acre.

The Franks left Tiberias and camped beneath the hill of Kawkab.⁴ Saladin moved towards them and sent troops to shoot arrows at them, but they held their position and made no move to give battle. He ordered his two nephews, Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar and 'Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh, to charge the Franks with their troops. They fought a fierce engagement and then the Franks withdrew in battle order and made camp at 'Afrabalā'.⁵ When Saladin saw the damage that he had inflicted on them and their lands, he retired to Damascus.

[482] Account of the siege of Beirut

From Damascus Saladin went to Beirut and ravaged its locality. He had ordered the Egyptian fleet to sail to Beirut. They came and blockaded it, attacking it and its region. Saladin came and linked up with them, plundering what the fleet had not got to. He besieged Beirut for a number of days, intending to persist until he took it. News came to him, while he was attacking it, that the sea had cast up at Damietta a Frankish transport carrying many people who had set out to make the Pilgrimage to Jerusalem. They [managed to] make captives of [many of] them before many [that remained] drowned. The number of prisoners was 1,676. This was a cause for victory drums to be beaten.

⁴ That is the castle of Belvoir.

⁵ Correct the spelling of this toponym in the text. 'Afrabalā' is in the Jordan Valley, north of Baysan (see Le Strange, *Palestine*, 385). It is the modern Tayyiba and was known to the Franks as Forbelet (Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 168-9).

Account of Saladin's crossing the Euphrates and taking the Jazīra lands

In this year Saladin crossed the Euphrates to the lands of the Jazīra and conquered them. This came about because Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkburī ibn Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Baktakīn, the fief-holder of Ḥarrān, who had been assigned it by Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn, both the city and the citadel, because he was trusted and relied upon, made contact with Saladin, while he was besieging Beirut, to inform him that he was with him, a friend of his rule, and he promised him support if he crossed the Euphrates, encouraging him and urging him to [483] come. Saladin left Beirut, while Muẓaffar al-Dīn's envoys were coming to him one after the other, urging him to come, so he made all haste, giving out that he was planning to besiege Aleppo, to conceal the real situation.

When he was near the Euphrates,⁶ Muẓaffar al-Dīn came and, having crossed the river, met with Saladin. They together marched to Bira which is a strong fortress on the east bank of the Euphrates. Its lord had already joined Saladin and had offered him his allegiance, the reason for which we have already mentioned. He and his army crossed the Euphrates by the bridge that is at Bira.

When ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, and Mujāhid al-Dīn heard of Saladin's arrival in Syria, they had assembled their army and proceeded to Nisibis to be prepared and concentrated to prevent Saladin interfering with Aleppo. They then advanced to Dārā, where they camped. Something that had not been taken into account then happened. News that Saladin had crossed the Euphrates came to them, so they retired to Mosul and sent a force to Edessa to hold and protect it. Hearing this, Saladin's eagerness grew. After crossing the river Saladin wrote to the princes of these regions and made them fine promises, offering them lavish gifts for their support.⁷ Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān, ruler of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā], responded to his request, because of the agreement that had been reached between them when Nūr al-Dīn was with him in Syria. It was agreed that Saladin would besiege Āmid, take it and then hand it over to him.

Saladin marched to Edessa, which he put under siege in Jumādā I [September 1182], attacking it fiercely. A soldier who was there told me that he counted fourteen holes in a spear covering, where arrows had pierced it. The assaults were kept up regularly. The fief-holder was there at this time, namely Emir Fakhr al-Dīn [484] Maṣ‘ūd al-Za‘farānī. When he saw the intensity of the assault he accepted that he should submit, asked for terms and surrendered the city, joining the service of Saladin. Having taken the city, Saladin attacked the citadel, which was yielded to him by the castellan there in return for receiving some money. After its fall he handed it over to Muẓaffar al-Dīn, along with Ḥarrān. He then went, by way of

⁶ *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 23: 'near Aleppo', where he arrived on 18 Jumādā I/19 September 1182 and stayed for three days (Bahā' al-Dīn, 57).

⁷ Imād al-Dīn's letters to local rulers guaranteed their continued rule if they submitted and undertook to provide troops for the Jihad (*Barq al-shāmī*, v, 26).

Ḩarrān, to Raqqā. When he arrived there, its fief-holder, Qutb al-Dīn Yīnāl ibn Ḥassān al-Manbijī, deserted it and went to Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn. Saladin took it over and then proceeded to Khābūr, Qarqisiyā, Māksīn and ‘Arābān, all of which he took control of.

After having taken all of Khābūr, he went to Nisibis, where he immediately took the city. The citadel held out but, after a siege of a number of days, he took that too. He stayed there to put its affairs in order and assigned it as a fief to an emir who was with him, called Abū'l-Hayjā' the Fat, before departing, accompanied by Nūr al-Dīn, ruler of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā].

He received news that the Franks had attacked Damascus and plundered its villages. They reached Darayyā and planned to demolish its mosque. The governor in Damascus sent a group of local Christians to them to say, ‘If you demolish the mosque we shall build it again but we shall demolish every church you have in our lands and allow no one to rebuild them.’ They therefore left it alone. When news of this came to Saladin, those who were zealous for the honour of the religion advised him to return, but he said, ‘They may ruin some villages, yet we will conquer lands to replace them and we shall revive them again and gain strength to attack their lands’, so he did not return. Things came about just as he said.

Account of Saladin's siege of Mosul

When he had taken Nisibis, he gathered his emirs and his counsellors and asked their advice about which city to begin with and which to attack, Mosul or Sinjār or Jazīrat ibn [485] ‘Umar. They gave conflicting opinions. Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī ibn Zayn al-Dīn said, ‘A start should be made with none other but Mosul. It is in our power with no defender. When ‘Izz al-Dīn and Mujāhid al-Dīn hear of our march there, they will abandon it and go to one of the castles in the Uplands.’ Saladin's nephew, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shirkūh, agreed, for he had offered Saladin a large sum of money to give him Mosul as a fief, if he conquered it, and Saladin had granted his request. He proposed this view because of his own interest.

Saladin marched on Mosul. Its ruler, ‘Izz al-Dīn, and Mujāhid al-Dīn had assembled large forces there, both cavalry and infantry, and produced weapons and siege engines sufficient to amaze the beholder. They disbursed much money and Mujāhid al-Dīn spent much of his own. He personally kept busy with affairs and made excellent dispositions. They also supplied the places that remained in their hands, such as Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar], Sinjār and Irbil among others, with men, weapons and money.

Saladin advanced until he was near Mosul. Then he left the army and along with Muẓaffar al-Dīn, his nephew Nāṣir al-Dīn and a small band of his leading magnates approached the city by themselves. When they drew near, he viewed and assessed it and what he saw amazed him and overawed both him and his

companions, for he beheld a great and mighty city, its wall and outworks crowded with men and not a battlement without a fighting man posted there, apart from the common citizens viewing the scene from the wall. Seeing this, he realized that he was unable to take it and that he would retire disappointed. He said to his nephew Nāṣir al-Dīn, ‘When we return to the camp, produce the money that you offered. We hold you to what was said.’ Nāṣir al-Dīn replied, ‘I retract the offer of money I made. This city is too strong to be attacked.’ Saladin then said to him and to Muẓaffar al-Dīn, ‘You have both deceived me. You encouraged me in an impossible task. If I had attacked somewhere else first, it would have been easier to take by the fame and awe we would have acquired. If we besiege it and then withdraw, our reputation will be shattered and our edge and power blunted.’

[486] He returned to his camp and the next morning came to the city. He put it under siege in Rajab [November 1182] and invested the town closely.⁸ He took a position opposite the Kinda Gate and posted the lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā] at the Bridge Gate and his brother Tāj al-Mulūk at the ‘Imādī Gate. The assault began and he gained no advantage. One day some of the common people made a sally and inflicted losses. ‘Izz al-Dīn and Mujāhid al-Dīn did not allow any of the regular troops to go out to fight; they were confined to the walls. Taqī al-Dīn advised his uncle Saladin to erect a trebuchet but Saladin said, ‘No trebuchet can be set up against a city like this. If we erect it, they will seize it. If we were to destroy a tower and a curtain wall, who can enter the city with this vast multitude within?’ Taqī al-Dīn persisted, saying, ‘Let us try them with it’, so he finally set one up. In response to it nine trebuchets were erected in the city and then a band of citizens emerged and seized it after much fighting around it. One of the citizens took off a boot with many nails and threw it at an emir called Jāwulī al-Asadī, the commander and senior member of the Asadiyya. It hit him on the chest and gave him severe pain. He picked up the boot and retired from the battle to Saladin and said, ‘The people of Mosul now fight us with maces⁹ we have never seen the like of’. He threw down the boot and swore that he would not fight again, outraged that he had been hit by such a thing.¹⁰

Saladin next moved from his position close to the city and camped at some distance from fear of night sorties, for, when close to, he could not be safe from them. Another reason was that Mujāhid al-Dīn one night sent out a group of men by the postern gate of the citadel, bearing torches. One of them was leaving by the gate and going down to the Euphrates, near the Sulphur Spring, and putting the lantern out. The army saw the people coming out and were convinced of a surprise attack. This led to their departure and withdrawal, so that night sorties would be impossible for the Mosul defenders.

⁸ Bahā’ al-Dīn, 57, says the siege began Thursday 11 Rajab/12 November 1182.

⁹ Reading *jumāqāt*.

¹⁰ This is somewhat of a *topos*, a ‘chivalric’ warrior outraged by contact with *hoi polloi*!

Before the beginning of the siege Şadr al-Dīn the Chief Shaykh (God have mercy on him) had come to Saladin, accompanied by Bashīr the Eunuch, one of the eunuchs of the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, to propose peace. They stayed with Saladin before Mosul and envoys went to and fro to ‘Izz al-Dīn and Mujāhid [487] al-Dīn to discuss peace. ‘Izz al-Dīn demanded the restoration of the lands that had been taken from him, to which Saladin agreed on condition that Aleppo be surrendered to him. ‘Izz al-Dīn and Mujāhid al-Dīn refused, so then Saladin dropped that and agreed to give up the lands on condition that they abandon their aid for the lord of Aleppo against him. Again they would not accept that. ‘Izz al-Dīn said, ‘He is my brother and he has undertakings and compacts that it is beyond me to break.’

Envoy from Qizil Arslān, lord of Azerbayjan, and envoys of Shāh Arman, lord of Khilāt, also arrived on the same matter, but nothing was arranged and no peace concluded. When Saladin saw that he would achieve nothing with regard to Mosul and only gain trouble and weariness and that the troops of Mosul who were at Sinjār were blocking the route of those troops and men of his who were trying to get to him, he departed from Mosul to go to Sinjār.¹¹

Account of Saladin's capture of Sinjār

When Saladin left Mosul to go to Sinjār, Mujāhid al-Dīn sent a force there to strengthen and reinforce it. Saladin heard of this and prevented their reaching it. He inflicted a defeat on them and took their weapons and horses. Then he came to Sinjār and put it under siege. It was held by Sharaf al-Dīn Amīr Amīrān Hindaw, the brother of ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, with a garrison. The town was closely invested and the assault pressed hard. One of the Kurdish emirs there, a member of the Zarzariyya tribe, wrote to Saladin and conspired with him, advising him to attack at the section where he was posted so that he could surrender the town. When Saladin came to him by night, he yielded his section which led to the fall of the barbican but nothing more. However, having heard this news, Sharaf al-Dīn in despair and dejection asked for terms, which were granted.¹² Had he resisted in that section, he would have forced Saladin's forces out and had he resisted in the citadel he would have held it securely, but he was incompetent. When he asked for terms, Saladin agreed to grant them to him. [488] He gave him guarantees and took over the town. Sharaf al-Dīn with his men went to Mosul.

With the conquest of Sinjār all that Saladin had taken was made secure, for he had borne it in mind that, if he went away, the Mosulis would recover it since it possessed no fortress other than Edessa. However, when he took Sinjār, it became like a wall to protect all of it. He appointed as his deputy there Sa'd al-Dīn ibn

¹¹ He arrived on 16 Sha'bān/15 December 1182 (Bahā' al-Dīn, 58).

¹² Sinjār fell on 2 Ramadān/30 December 1182 according to Bahā' al-Dīn, 58.

Mu‘īn al-Dīn Unur, one of his senior emirs and one of the best of them in appearance and substance.

Account of Saladin's return to Ḥarrān

After having taken Sinjār and settled its affairs, he went to Nisibis, where he was met by the inhabitants complaining about Abū'l-Hayja' the Fat and weeping at his tyranny, in regret for the regime of ‘Izz al-Dīn and his justice towards them. When this came to Saladin's attention, he condemned Abū'l-Hayjā's oppressive rule, dismissed him and took him with him when he went to Ḥarrān. He dispersed the army so that they could take some rest and remained with a limited force among his close staff and trusted companions. His arrival at Ḥarrān was in the early part of Dhū'l-Qa‘da of this year [began 26 February 1183].

Account of the alliance of ‘Izz al-Dīn and Shāh Arman

In Dhū'l-Hijja this year [28 March–15 April 1183] Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, and Shāh Arman, lord of Khilāt, formed an alliance to oppose Saladin. This came about as follows. ‘Izz al-Dīn's envoys went frequently to Shāh Arman, asking for aid and support [489] against Saladin. Shāh Arman sent a number of envoys to Saladin to use his good offices to persuade him to keep his hands off Mosul and whatever concerns ‘Izz al-Dīn, but Saladin did not accept this and answered in blunt terms. Finally Shāh Arman sent him his mamluke, Sayf al-Dīn Baktimur, who became ruler of Khilāt after Shāh Arman. He came to Saladin, while he was besieging Sinjār, to ask him to leave it alone and withdraw. Shāh Arman had said to him, ‘If he withdraws, [all well and good], but if not, threaten him with hostilities and military action.’ Baktimur delivered the offer of good offices but Saladin procrastinated with his reply, in the hope that Sinjār would fall. When Baktimur realized this, he delivered the second message of threats and left in an angry mood, neither accepting a robe of honour nor a gift [of money]. He told his master what had happened and warned him of the result of ignoring, and hesitating about, Saladin. Shāh Arman, who had been camping outside Khilāt, went to Mardīn, whose lord at that time was Quṭb al-Dīn ibn Najm al-Dīn Alpī, the nephew of Shāh Arman and cousin and father-in-law of ‘Izz al-Dīn (for the latter had married his daughter to Quṭb al-Dīn) and with Shāh Arman came Dawlat Shāh, lord of Badlīs and Arzan. Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn left Mosul with his army without any heavy baggage train.

Saladin had taken Sinjār, left it to go to Ḥarrān and dispersed his forces. When he heard of the enemies' alliance, he sent to Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew, in Hama, to summon him and he arrived with all haste. He advised a march [to meet them¹³].

¹³ Following the addition (*ilayhim*) given in one Ms.

Others warned against it but Saladin's own predilection was for the move, so he set out for Ra's 'Ayn. When the enemy heard of his march, they broke up. Shāh Arman returned to Khilāt, with the excuse that he would assemble his troops and come back; 'Izz al-Dīn returned to Mosul; Quṭb al-Dīn remained at Mardīn. Saladin moved on and made camp for several days at Harzam¹⁴ below Mardīn.

[490] Account of the victory over the Franks in the Red Sea¹⁵

This year the Prince, lord of Kerak, fabricated a fleet of vessels which he completed at Kerak. All that remained was to assemble the various pieces together. He transported them to the Gulf of Ayla [Aqaba] and assembled them in very quick time. Having finished them, he manned them with fighting men and sent them off to sea. However, they formed two groups. One group stayed at the fort of Ayla to besiege the Muslims who were holding it and to prevent them getting water. The defenders suffered great hardship and much distress. The second group sailed towards 'Aydhāb and did much damage along the coast. They took plunder and seized whatever Muslim ships they found and the merchants on board. They surprised the people in those regions, taking them quite unawares. They had never any experience of a Frank in that sea, neither as merchant nor soldier.

Al-Malik al-'Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb was in Egypt as lieutenant for his brother Saladin. He built and dispatched a fleet with a great host of Muslims, commanded by Ḥusām al-Dīn Lu'lū', the admiral of the fleet in Egypt. He was a man who had had many victories, brave and noble. Lu'lū' set out in pursuit of them with all speed. He began with those at Ayla, swooping down on them like an eagle on its prey. Engaging them, he killed some and captured the rest. Immediately in the afternoon he sailed to follow the course of those who had attacked 'Aydhāb but there was no sight of them. They had raided all that they could find and killed those they had come across there and set sail for a different harbour to do as they had done at 'Aydhāb. Their plan was to enter the Hijaz, Mecca and Medina (may God Almighty defend them), and to seize the pilgrims and keep them from the Sacred House, then to enter Yemen.

When Lu'lū' came to 'Aydhāb and did not see them there, he continued on their tracks and reached Rābigh¹⁶ [491] and the coast of al-Ḥawrā¹⁷ among other places.

¹⁴ Situated six miles south-west of Mardīn. According to Yāqūt, ii, 239, the population consisted mostly of Armenians.

¹⁵ The text has 'the sea of 'Aydhāb'. 'Aydhāb was an important trading and pilgrimage port on the west coast of the Red Sea.

¹⁶ On the coast of the Arabian peninsula, 90 miles north of Jeddah.

¹⁷ Here and immediately below *Kāmil* reads: al-Jawzā'. Ḥawrā' is mentioned in a report of these events sent to Baghdad (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 138). This anchorage on the east shore of the Red Sea is half-way between al-Wajh and Yanbu', see *Šubḥ*, xiv, 387 and Yāqūt, ii, 356, where it was reported to be uninhabited in 626/1229.

He caught up with them on the coast of al-Hawrā' and fell upon them there. When they saw their wretched situation and stared death in the face, they disembarked and took refuge in a ravine there. Lu'lū' also disembarked and fought them fiercely. He took horses from the Bedouin of that place, mounted them and engaged the Franks with both horse and foot. He overcame them and killed the majority. The rest he took prisoner and some of them he sent to Minā to be sacrificed there as an exemplary punishment for those who desire to cause terror at God's sanctuary and the sanctuary of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace). He took the remainder back to Egypt, where they were all put to death.¹⁸

Miscellaneous events

In Jumādā I this year [September 1182] ‘Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh, Saladin’s nephew, died. He was his lieutenant at Damascus, the trusted member of his family, on whom he relied more than all his relatives and emirs. He was brave, generous and learned, knowledgeable in literature and other matters, the author of some excellent poetry amongst that which has been written by princes.

The beginning of his illness was when he left Damascus to raid the Franks. He fell sick, came home ill and died. The news of his death came to Saladin, after he had crossed the Euphrates into the Jazīra lands. He sent Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Muqaddam back to Damascus to take command of the local forces.

The following died this year:

Fakhr al-Dawla Abū'l-Muzaffar¹⁹ al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Muṭalib. His father was vizier of the caliph and his brother major-domo. He himself had been a Sufi from his youth. He built a madrasah and a hospice in Baghdad near the Cistern Arch and he also built a mosque on the West Bank of Baghdad.

Emir Abū Mansūr Hāshim, son of al-Mustadī' bi-Amr Allāh. He was buried next to his father.²⁰

Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Rifā'i,²¹ from the hinterland of Wāsiṭ. He was a pious man and greatly revered and respected by the people. He had innumerable disciples.

¹⁸ All this took place in Shawwāl/February 1183, according to *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 69.

¹⁹ The text inserts an 'ibn' here but see Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 371–2; he died in Shawwāl/February 1183 and was buried in his hospice (*ribāṭ* or *khānqāh*) which had a window onto the Tigris. Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī saw it in 645/1247–8, partly encroached upon by the river and threatened with complete ruin.

²⁰ He died in Sha'bān/December 1182 (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 372).

²¹ Aḥmad ibn al-Rifā'i (correct the text's Raftī) was the eponymous founder of the Rifā'iyya Sufi order. He was born in the Marshlands of southern Iraq in 1106 and died on Thursday 12 Jumādā I/ 16 September 1182. See Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 370–71; Trimingham, *Sufi Orders*, 37–40.

**Account of Saladin's taking of Āmid and the granting of it to the lord of
Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]**

We have mentioned that Saladin camped at Ḥarzam below Mardin. He saw no way of achieving his desired purpose, so he left it to go to Āmid by way of al-Bārī'iyya. Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān was constantly pressing him to attack Āmid, take it and assign it to himself, as had been agreed between them both. He came to Āmid on 17 Dhū'l-Hijja of the year 578 [13 April 1183], encamped there and settled down to maintain a siege.

The man who governed and held authority there was Bahā' al-Dīn ibn Nīsān. Its ruler had no actual power alongside Ibn Nīsān. When Saladin imposed the siege Ibn Nīsān did not adopt good measures; he did not give the people any of the stores and distributed among them neither dinars nor food. He said to the inhabitants, 'Fight for your lives', to which one of his men replied, 'The enemy is not an infidel that they should have to fight for their lives', but he did nothing. Saladin began the attack, set up trebuchets and then carried out an assault, though the place was in the highest degree strong and defensible, indeed it and its city walls were proverbial. Ibn Nīsān continued his course of niggardliness with money. His behaviour was that of a man on whom fortune had turned its back and whose power had slipped away. When people saw that, they put little effort into the fighting and inclined to self-preservation.

The period of Ibn Nīsān had been lengthy and had weighed heavily on the people because of his bad treatment of them, his grip on them and his making it hard¹ for them to earn a living. Therefore they hated his time and wanted it to end. [494] Saladin ordered that messages tied to arrows should be sent to the people, promising them good and generous treatment if they obeyed him but threatening them if they resisted. This made them more idle and dispirited. They wanted Saladin to rule and gave up fighting. His sappers reached the wall, dug and prepared mines under it. When the garrison and the citizens realized this, they became bold towards Ibn Nīsān and extreme in their demands. At this juncture Ibn Nīsān sent his womenfolk out to al-Qādī al-Fāḍil, Saladin's vizier, asking him to secure guarantees for himself, his family and property and to give him three days' delay to transport the money and stores he had in the town. Al-Fāḍil performed this service for him and Saladin gave his agreement. Ibn Nīsān surrendered the town during the first third of Muḥarram [26 April-5 May 1183] and moved his tents

¹ In this sentence the edition's *tadyiqihim* has been amended to *tadyiqihi* as in *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xi, 325, where other differences are also found.

outside the town and desired to shift his property but that he was unable to do because of his loss of authority over his men and their rejection of all his orders. He sent to inform Saladin of this and to ask him for assistance. Saladin supplied him with pack animals and men, so some was brought out but some was pillaged. The three days elapsed before the task was over and he was denied what remained. The town's towers were full of all sorts of stores but he had left them untouched. Had he issued a part of them, he would have held the town and all his goods and money. However, when God wills a thing he prepares its means.

When Saladin received the town he handed it over to Nūr al-Dīn, lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]. Before he did so, he was told, 'This town contains stores worth more than 1,000,000 dinars. If you were to take them, distribute them to your army and followers and give him the town empty, he would be content. He does not hope for more than that.' Saladin rejected this and replied, 'I am not a man to give him the fundamentals and to stint on the subsidiaries.' After he had taken over the town, Nūr al-Dīn provided a great feast to which he invited Saladin and his emirs. Saladin had not [previously] entered the town. [Nūr al-Dīn] presented to him and his men a great many gifts.

[495] Account of Saladin's taking Tell Khālid and 'Ayntāb in Syria

Having finished with Āmid Saladin went to Syria, making for Tell Khālid, which is part of the district of Aleppo. He besieged it² and bombarded it with trebuchets. The defenders came down and asked for terms, which he granted them. He received its surrender also in Muḥarram³ [May 1183].

From there he proceeded to 'Ayntāb and put it under siege. It was held by Nāṣīḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad,⁴ the brother of Shaykh Ismā'īl, who was the treasurer of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī and his friend. Nūr al-Dīn had entrusted it to him and it stayed in his hands until this present time. When Saladin invested it, he sent asking for the fortress to be confirmed in his possession, [offering] to descend to do obeisance and to be under his authority and suzerainty. Saladin accepted this and gave him his oath, so Nāṣīḥ al-Dīn came down and put himself at his service. This was also in Muḥarram of this year.

Account of two battles with the Franks, at sea and in Syria

On 10 Muḥarram [5 May 1183] the Muslim fleet sailed from Egypt and met a transport vessel carrying about 300 fully-armed Franks along with money and

² On Tuesday 12 Muḥarram/7 May 1183, a Saturday! (*Barq al-shāmī*, v, 112).

³ According to Ibn Abī Ṭayy, quoted in *Rawḍatayn*, iii, 156, on 14 Muḥarram/9 May 1183.

⁴ In *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 112; *Sanā al-barq*, 223; Sibṭ ibn al-Jāwzī, 375, called Nāṣīḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Khumārtakīn. The *Kāmil* text has Nāṣir al-Dīn.

weapons for the Levantine Franks. They engaged them and both sides fought stubbornly until victory went to the Muslims. Having taken the Franks prisoner, they killed some and kept the others in captivity. They seized all that was with them and returned to Egypt safe and sound.⁵

Also in this year a large company of Franks set out from the region of Dārūm towards Egypt to raid and pillage. The Muslims heard of them and went out⁶ to meet them by the route of [496] Sadr and Ayla. The Franks withdrew before them and camped at a watering place called al-‘Usayla.⁷ They reached it before the Muslims, who arrived thirsty and on the point of death. They saw that the Franks had occupied the spring but God (praised and mighty is He!) in His mercy formed a great cloud which rained upon them so that they slaked their thirst. It was high summer and the heat was intense in a deadly waste. Their spirits were strengthened when they witnessed this and they trusted that God would give them victory. They engaged the Franks and God did give them victory. They slew them and only the isolated fugitive escaped. The Muslims seized the weapons and horses that the Franks had with them and returned victorious and triumphant through the grace of God.

Account of Saladin's taking of Aleppo

This year Saladin marched from ‘Ayntāb to Aleppo, before which he camped, at the Green Hippodrome, again during Muḥarram. He remained there for a number of days and then moved to Mount Jawshan, on the top of which he pitched his camp, and made clear that he intended to build dwellings for himself, his companions and his troops. For some days he remained busy on them, while there was daily fighting between the two armies.

The lord of Aleppo, ‘Imad al-Dīn Zankī ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, had with him the army of Nūr al-Dīn, who fought wholeheartedly. However, when he saw the great expense, it was as though he became miserly with money. One day one of his soldiers came to him and asked him for something, but he made an excuse that he had little money. Another man said to him, ‘Anyone who hopes to hold a place such as Aleppo would spend his money, even if it meant selling his women’s jewelry.’ It was then that he came to favour surrendering Aleppo and taking somewhere in exchange. He sent a message with [497] Emir Tūmān al-Yārūqī, who was in favour of Saladin and whose sympathies were with him, which is why he sent him. He arrived at an agreed settlement that ‘Imād al-Dīn would surrender

⁵ The fleet sailed from Damietta on 15 Muharram/10 May and returned 24th/19 May, according to *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 141.

⁶ With the governor of Egypt's Sharqiyya province (*Barq al-shāmī*, v, 141).

⁷ A place of this name is approximately 80 miles N.E. of Medina (see Cornu, *Atlas*, 88), but is surely too deep in Arabia. For a place in Sinai or the Negev, see Yāqūt, iii, 678.

Aleppo to Saladin and in exchange receive Sinjār, Nisibis, Khābūr, Raqqa and Sarūj. Oaths were sworn and thus he sold it for the most paltry of prices; he gave up a fortress like Aleppo and received in exchange some villages and fields! He left on 18 Ṣafar⁸ [=11 June 1183] and Saladin took it over. Everyone was amazed at this and condemned what he had done. Indeed, some of the common people of Aleppo brought a tub with water and shouted out, ‘You are not fit to rule. You are only fit to wash clothes’, and they subjected him to other insults.

With this gain Saladin’s power became established, although it had been shaky; through the surrender of this place his foot became firmly fixed, although it had been on the brink of an overhanging precipice. When God wills a matter, there is no turning it away.⁹

‘Imād al-Dīn went to the towns he had been given to replace Aleppo and took them over; Saladin took Aleppo. It was agreed between them that ‘Imād al-Dīn would present himself at Saladin’s service in person and with his army. If he were summoned, he was to make no excuses. It was a surprising fact that Muhyī al-Dīn ibn al-Zakī, cadi of Damascus, praised Saladin with an ode that contained:

Your conquest of Aleppo with the sword in Ṣafar
Is a good augury for the conquest of Jerusalem in Rajab.

The conquest of Jerusalem did indeed fall in Rajab of the year 583 [October 1187], as we shall narrate, God Almighty willing.

Among what al-Qādī al-Fāḍil wrote on this subject on behalf of Saladin is the following: ‘We gave him for Aleppo such-and-such places. This is an exchange in truth! We took dinars from him and gave him dirhams. We gave up villages and acquired major cities.’¹⁰

[498] He also wrote: ‘We gave him what did not leave our hands,’ meaning that whenever Saladin wished, he could take it back because of the lack of fortifications.¹¹

Among those who were killed at Aleppo was Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī, Saladin’s youngest brother.¹² He was a brave soldier, noble and mild, who united all good qualities and admirable traits. He received a thrust in his knee, which was dislocated. This caused his death after peace had been made between ‘Imād al-Dīn and Saladin on the basis of the surrender of Aleppo and before Saladin actually

⁸ ‘Imād al-Dīn specifies Saturday/= 11 June (*Barq al-shāmī*, v, 118).

⁹ There is an echo of Koran, xiii, 11 here.

¹⁰ Al-Qādī al-Fāḍil’s letter to al-‘Ādil is quoted with variations in *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 128.

¹¹ This is a rather slanted interpretation by Ibn al-Athīr. In *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 129, the passage continues: ‘because service in person and by his troops has been imposed as a condition on him.’

¹² He was born in Dhū'l-Hijja 556/November-December 1161 (Ṣibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 378).

entered the city. When peace had been arranged Saladin came to pay his brother a sick visit and said to him, 'Well, we have taken Aleppo and it is yours'. He replied, 'That is so had it been while I lived. By God, you have taken it dearly since you lose a man like me!' Saladin wept and brought others to tears.

When 'Imād al-Dīn came out to Saladin and a feast had been prepared for him, Saladin celebrated. While they were all rejoicing, a man came and whispered to Saladin that his brother had died. He betrayed no shock or grief but ordered him to be prepared for burial secretly. 'Imād al-Dīn and those with him were unaware. He bore his sadness alone in order that the enjoyment of others should not be spoilt. This is indeed an example of 'goodly endurance'.¹³

Account of Saladin's conquest of Hārim

After Saladin's taking of Aleppo, there was in the citadel of Hārim, one of the dependencies of Aleppo, a certain mamluke of Nūr al-Dīn, named Sarkhak, whom al-Malik al-Šāliḥ¹⁴ had appointed as governor there. He refused to hand it over to Saladin, who wrote to him about surrendering it and said to him, 'Ask for any fief you wish'. He made him fair promises but Sarkhak made excessive demands. [499] Envoys were exchanged but Sarkhak contacted the Franks to seek their protection. The troops who were with him heard that he was in communication with the Franks and feared that he would surrender the citadel to them, so they fell on him, arrested and imprisoned him, then wrote to Saladin asking for safe conduct and reward. He agreed to their request. After they had yielded the fortress to him, he placed there one of his close emirs as castellan.

As for the remaining fortresses of Aleppo, Saladin kept 'Ayntāb in the hands of its lord, as has been mentioned previously, and he assigned Tell Khālid to an emir called Dildirim¹⁵ al-Yārūqī, who was [already] the lord of Tell Bāshir. The citadel of A'zāz had already been demolished by 'Imād al-Dīn Ghāzī.¹⁶ Saladin gave it as a fief to an emir called 'Alam al-Dīn¹⁷ Sulaymān ibn Jandār, who restored it. Saladin remained in Aleppo until he had completed its organization, its affairs and its administration. He assigned its various districts and sent out messages and gathered his forces from all its lands.

¹³ In Arabic *al-ṣabr al-jamil*. Cf. Koran, xii, 18 and 83; lxx, 5.

¹⁴ The text incorrectly adds 'Imād al-Dīn at this point. The regnal title of 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī II was al-Malik al-Ādil. For the appointment of Sarkhak, see above p. [446].

¹⁵ The text has Dārūm, an easy copyist error in Arabic script.

¹⁶ Correct the text's 'Sulaymān'. See Bahā' al-Dīn, 58-9: A'zāz was razed on 9 Jumāda II 578/10 October 1182; cf. *Barq al-shāmī*, v, 133.

¹⁷ The text, which is especially prone to error in this section, reads Dildirim instead of this title.

Account of the arrest of Mujāhid al-Dīn and the harm that resulted from that

In Jumādā I [22 August–20 September 1183] ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd, ruler of Mosul, arrested his lieutenant Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz, who held authority throughout the land. In this he followed the desires of those who wished advantage for themselves and did not consider the harm done to their lord. The persons who advised this were ‘Izz al-Dīn Maḥmūd Zulfandār and Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Abī'l-Khayr, whose father had been lord of al-Gharrāf.¹⁸ They were both among the senior emirs. [500] When ['Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd] wanted to arrest Mujāhid al-Dīn, he did not dare to do it because of his power, so he pretended to be ill and gave up appearing on horseback for several days. Mujāhid al-Dīn visited him alone. He was a eunuch and was not prevented from entering the women's quarters. When he came in to see him, ‘Izz al-Dīn arrested him, rode immediately to the citadel and appropriated the money and stores that Mujāhid al-Dīn had. He appointed Zulfandār as the next governor of the Mosul citadel, made the son of the lord of al-Gharrāf emir-chamberlain and gave them both authority over his state.

At this time Irbil and its dependencies were under Mujāhid al-Dīn's control. With him there was Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī, who was a young lad with no share of authority. Authority and the standing army belonged to Mujāhid al-Dīn. Also under his control was Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar, which was [nominally] held by Mu‘izz al-Dīn Sanjar Shāh ibn Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Mawdūd, who was also a child. Authority, the deputies and the regular troop were all Mujāhid al-Dīn's. In addition he held Shahrazūr and its dependencies, where his deputies were in post, Daqūqā with his deputy there, and the fortress of ‘Aqr al-Ḥumaydiyya with his deputy. After Saladin had taken the Jazīra lands nothing was left to ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd apart from Mosul, although its citadel was in Mujāhid al-Dīn's hands and he in truth was the prince while only the title was ‘Izz al-Dīn's. When he was arrested, the lord of Irbil refused obedience to ‘Izz al-Dīn and took full power, and likewise the lord of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar. The caliph sent to Daqūqā, besieged and took it. ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd acquired only Shahrazūr and ‘Aqr. Irbil and Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] became a very great source of trouble to the lord of Mosul. Their lords sent to Saladin, offering him allegiance and to be at his service.

The Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh had sent to Saladin Ṣadr al-Dīn the Chief Shaykh, accompanied by Bashīr, the special palace eunuch, to discuss peace with ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul. The latter sent with him Cadi Muhyī al-Dīn Abū Ḥāmid ibn al-Shahrazūrī on the same matter. Saladin responded favourably to this but said, ‘You have no claim on Jazīrat ibn ‘Umar or Irbil.’ [501] Muhyī al-Dīn objected to this and said, ‘They are ours’. However, Saladin would agree to make peace only on condition that Irbil and Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar go to him. The matter was not settled, but Saladin's ambition for Mosul was increased by the arrest of

¹⁸ This seems to be the name of a navigable canal and villages along it below Wāsiṭ (Yāqūt, iii, 780; Krawulsky, 481).

Mujāhid al-Dīn. When ‘Izz al-Dīn saw the harm done by the arrest of Mujāhid al-Dīn, he seized Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad, the son of the lord of al-Gharrāf, and Zulfandār to punish them. He later freed Mujāhid al-Dīn, as we shall narrate, if God wills.

Account of the raid on Baysān

When Saladin had finished with Aleppo, he installed his son, al-Malik al-Zāhir Ghāzī, who was a youth, and placed alongside him Emir Sayf al-Dīn Yāzkūj, the senior emir of the Asadiyya. He then went to Damascus and made preparations for a raid with the forces of Syria, Jazīra and Diyār Bakr. He marched into Frankish territory and crossed the Jordan on 9 Jumādā II [29 September 1183]. He found that the inhabitants of those regions had already abandoned them in fear. He went to Baysān, which he burnt and destroyed and ravaged everything there. Meanwhile the Franks concentrated their forces and came to oppose him, but when they saw the great number of his troops, they did not engage with him. Saladin remained in contact with them, after they had taken up a position on a hill there and dug defensive ditches. Saladin encircled them as the Muslim troops were harassing them with arrows and skirmishing with them. However, they did not leave their lines and stayed thus for five days. The Muslims retired on 17 Jumādā II [7 October 1183] in the hope that the Franks would be eager and follow them, so they could lure them on to achieve something decisive against them. Realizing this, the Franks had no ambition for themselves other than survival.

The Muslims raided those districts both southward and northward¹⁹ and reached areas that they had not dreamt of reaching or venturing into. When the amount of booty they had became large, [502] they judged it best to return victoriously to their own lands with what they had seized. They therefore returned with every intention of further raids.

Account of the raid on Kerak and al-‘Ādil’s becoming ruler at Aleppo

After Saladin and the Muslims had returned from the raid on Baysān, he made preparations to raid Kerak and set out with his troops. He wrote to his brother al-‘Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb, who was his deputy in Egypt, ordering him to march with all his forces to Kerak. Al-‘Ādil had written to Saladin to ask him for the city and citadel of Aleppo. This had been agreed and he was ordered to set out with his family and his treasure. Saladin came to Kerak during Rajab [20 October-18 November 1183], where he was joined by his brother al-‘Ādil with the Egyptian army. His combined army was numerous and he imposed a tight blockade. The

¹⁹ Literally ‘right and left’.

Muslims got into the suburb and took control of it, pressing the siege of the fortress from the suburb and gaining the upper hand in the battle. Seven trebuchets were set up which continued to hurl stones night and day.

Saladin had thought that the Franks would not allow him to besiege Kerak, that they would exert all their efforts to make him withdraw, so he had not brought with him sufficient siege engines for such a great fortress and impregnable stronghold. He retired in the middle of Sha'bān [3 December 1183].

He sent Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew, to Egypt to be his deputy there and take on the position that his brother al-‘Ādil had held. His brother al-‘Ādil he took with him to Damascus and gave him the city and citadel of Aleppo with its districts and the town of Manbij with its dependencies. He sent him there in the month of Ramadān [18 December 1183–16 January 1184] and called his son al-Zāhir to Damascus.

[503] Miscellaneous events

This year the hospice, which the caliph's mother had built in Ma'mūniyya, was opened.

In Dhū'l-Hijja [16 March–13 April 1184] there died in Baghdad Mukarram ibn Bakhtiyār, Abū'l-Khayr the ascetic. He was a student of Ḥadīth and was [known for] his frequent weeping.

In Jumādā II [21 September–19 October 1183] died Muḥammad ibn Bakhtiyār ibn ‘Abd Allāh, Abū ‘Abd al-Muwallad, the poet, known as al-Ablah (the Idiot).²⁰ An example of his poetry is:

He made my tears flow, no, rather he shed my blood
Cruelly by the ice from his cold lips.
He has a splendid stature, like a willow wand, and
An eye, from whose languid looks comes my sickness.
From his promise have I gained the truest
Promise and from union with him suspicion.

²⁰ Known thus, according to Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 379, 'because of his intelligence'!

Account of Mujāhid al-Dīn's release from prison and the defeat of the 'Ajām

In Muḥarram of this year [14 April-13 May 1184] Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, released Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz from prison on the intercession of Shams al-Dīn Pahlawān, the lord of Hamadhan and the Uplands, and sent him to Pahlawān and his brother Qizil to seek their aid against Saladin. First of all he went to Qizil, lord of Azerbayjan, who did not allow him to proceed to Pahlawān but said, 'What you wish I shall perform', and he equipped a large army of about 3,000 horse to go with him. They set out for Irbil to besiege it and when they drew near, they behaved badly in the area and ruined it, plundering and taking captives. They seized women by force and Mujāhid al-Dīn was unable to stop them. Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf, lord of Irbil, moved against them with his army and came upon them, when they were dispersed in the villages, plundering and burning. He seized the opportunity presented by their disorganized state and threw himself and his troops against the first of them he met and routed them. All were completely defeated and the men of Irbil seized their goods, mounts and weapons. The 'Ajām returned in rout to their lands, while the lord of Irbil returned to his, victorious and replete with booty. Mujāhid al-Dīn returned to Mosul. He used to say, 'I never ceased to expect God Almighty to punish the evil deeds of the 'Ajām. I witnessed from them what I never thought a Muslim could do to a Muslim. I commanded them to cease but they would not listen until they met with the defeat they had.'

[505] Account of the death of Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min and the succession of his son Ya'qūb

During this year Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min went to Andalusia. He crossed over the straits in a great assemblage of the troops of the Maghrib. He gathered and enlisted both infantry and cavalry. When he crossed the straits he made for the west of the country and for a month besieged the town of Shantarīn,¹ which was held by the Franks. However, he was overcome by an illness and died in Rabi' I [12 June-11 July 1184]. His body was carried in a coffin to the Andalusian city of Seville.

His reign had lasted twenty-two years and one month and he died without having nominated any of his sons to rule as successor. The commanders of the Almohads and the sons of 'Abd al-Mu'min all agreed to raise to power his son Abū

¹ Modern Santarém in Portugal, near the outflow of the River Tagus, see *EI*(2), ix, 308-9.

Yūsuf Ya'qūb ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min and they installed him when his father died, so that they should not be without a ruler to unite them as they were in the proximity of the enemy. He undertook this task in exemplary fashion, raised up the banner of the Jihad and ruled the people well. He was a pious man, who imposed the Koranic punishments among the elite and the commons. His rule became firmly established and his realm was fully submissive to him despite the great extent of its lands. He organized the frontier lands in Andalusia, settled them with men and garrisoned all the other lands with fighting men. Having arranged all their affairs, he returned to Marrakech.

His father Yūsuf was a good ruler. His ways were gentler than his father's ways with the people. He loved the ulema, favoured and consulted them. They provided his servants and his elite. The people loved him and inclined towards him. Lands that had resisted his father submitted to him. In the matter of tax collection he followed the path of his father and did not introduce fresh exactions. His lands flourished because he treated his subjects well and so things continued until his death (God Almighty have mercy on him).

[506] Account of Saladin's raid on Kerak

In Rabī' II [12 July-9 August 1184] Saladin left Damascus to go on a raid. He called his troops together and they came to him from every direction. Among those who came to him was Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān, lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]. Saladin wrote to Egypt to summon its troops to him at Kerak. He descended upon Kerak and put it under siege, blockading the defenders closely. He ordered the erection of trebuchets to attack the suburb. After a fierce fight the Muslims took the suburb but the citadel held out. Both it and the suburb are on the plateau of a single hill, except that they are divided by a great ditch about sixty cubits in depth. Saladin ordered stones and earth to be thrown into it to fill it but nobody was able to approach because of the intense volleys of arrows from arbalests and bows and of stones from trebuchets. He therefore ordered the construction in timber and mud brick of something beneath which the men would be able to walk up to the ditch without being hit by any of the arrows and stones. This was done and they began to move under this covering and throw material into the ditch to fill it. Meanwhile the Muslims' trebuchets were bombarding the citadel night and day.

The Franks within sent to their king and knights seeking support and informing them of their parlous state and their inability to hold the citadel. The Franks gathered to the last man and marched in haste to their aid. When Saladin heard of their march, he departed from Kerak to intercept them and bring them to battle and to return to Kerak after he had defeated them. He drew near them, made camp and took up his position but was unable to close with them because of the broken country and the difficult and narrow route to reach them. He stayed some days,

waiting for them to leave that position so that he could attack them. However, they did not move from it because they feared for their safety. Seeing that, he withdrew several furlongs and left facing them men who would tell him of any move they made. The Franks set out by night for Kerak and when he learnt of that, Saladin realized that he was not going to gain the upper hand on this occasion nor attain any objective. He proceeded to Nablus and plundered all the land on his route. Having arrived at Nablus, [507] he set fire to it, destroyed and sacked it. He killed, captured and enslaved many there. He then went on to Sebastea, the site of the shrine of Zacharias (upon him be peace), where there was a church and a number of Muslim prisoners. He freed them and proceeded to Jinin, which he sacked and ruined, before setting out back to Damascus. He sacked and destroyed what was on his route and dispatched squadrons right and left to gather booty and ravage, and so he came to Damascus.

Account of the Veiled Ones' conquest of Bougie and its restoration to the family of 'Abd al-Mu'min

In Sha'bān of this year [7 November–5 December 1184] 'Alī ibn Ishāq, known as Ibn al-Ghāniya, who was one of the leading Veiled Ones [Almoravids], the former rulers of the Maghrib, and who was now lord of the island of Majorca, came to Bougie and took possession of it. This came about because, when he heard of the death of Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min, he built a fleet of twenty vessels and sailed with his assembled troops and came to anchor on the coast at Bougie. His horse and foot, which numbered about 200 of the Almoravid cavalry and 4,000 infantry, disembarked and entered the city of Bougie without a fight because it so happened that the governor had gone to Marrakech a few days before and had not left any force or defenders there because there was no enemy to hold it against. The Almoravid came when it had not entered their calculations that he would venture such a thing. He anchored there and several of the survivors of the Banū Ḥammād dynasty made common cause with him. Through them his numbers increased and his morale was strengthened. The governor of Bougie heard this news and turned back, accompanied by 300 Almohad cavalry. He gathered together about 1,000 horsemen from the Arabs and the tribesmen of those regions. The Almoravid heard of this and that they were nearby. He moved out against them, now having 1,000 horse, They stood face to face for a while but then all the levies who were with the governor of Bougie defected to the Almoravid. The governor fled along with the Almohads under his command and went to Marrakech. Having returned to Bougie, the Almoravid gathered his army and entered the dependencies of Bougie, all of which offered him allegiance, except for Constantine.² He besieged it until the

² In Arabic *Qusanṭīnat al-Hawā*. See above p. [159] s.a. 547.

arrival of [508] an Almohad army from Marrakech in Ṣafar 581 [May 1185]. They came to Bougie by land and by sea. Yaḥyā and ‘Abd Allāh, brothers of ‘Alī ibn Ishāq the Almoravid, were there, but they abandoned it in flight and joined their brother, who departed from Constantine and travelled to Ifriqiya. The dispatch of the army from Marrakech came about because the governor of Bougie came to Ya‘qūb ibn Yūsuf, lord of the Maghrib, and told him what had happened at Bougie, how the Almoravids had seized control there, and he warned him of the consequences of dilatoriness. He sent off troops by land, 20,000 cavalry strong, and equipped his fleet with a large complement. They duly recovered possession of Bougie.

The account of the death of the lord of Mardīn and the accession of his son

This year³ Quṭb al-Dīn Īlghāzī ibn Najm al-Dīn Alpī ibn Timurtāsh ibn Īlghāzī ibn Artuq, lord of Mardīn, died and was succeeded by his son, Ḥusām al-Dīn Būlaq Arslān, who was an infant. Niẓām al-Dīn Alpqush, his father’s mamluke, undertook his upbringing and the administration of the state. Shāh Arman the lord of Khilāt was the maternal uncle of Quṭb al-Dīn and had held authority in his reign. He installed Alpqush alongside his son. Alpqush was pious, good and just, of good conduct and mild. He undertook his upbringing well and married his mother. When the boy grew up, Niẓām al-Dīn did not give him control of the affairs of state because of instability and thoughtlessness in his character. Niẓām al-Dīn had a mamluke whose name was Lu’lu’ who exercised authority and control in his regime and encouraged Niẓām al-Dīn in his treatment of the boy. The situation continued in this fashion until the boy died. He had a younger brother who was known as Quṭb al-Dīn, whom Niẓām al-Dīn installed as ruler, although he only had nominal power while real authority belonged to Niẓām al-Dīn and Lu’lu’.

So things continued until the year 601 [1204–5], when Niẓām al-Dīn Alpqush fell ill. [509] Quṭb al-Dīn came to pay a sick visit. When he left him, Lu’lu’ also left with him and Quṭb al-Dīn struck him with a dagger he had and killed him. He then entered into Niẓām al-Dīn’s presence, dagger in hand, and killed him too. He emerged alone with a mamluke of his and cast their heads before the troops, all of whom had been raised up by Niẓām al-Dīn and Lu’lu’, but they proclaimed their allegiance to Quṭb al-Dīn. After his seizure of power he drove out those he wanted to and kept on those he wanted to. He took control of the citadel of Mardīn and its districts, the fortress of al-Bāri‘iyya and Ṣūr. Until the present time he rules there, resolute in all he does.

³ According to ‘Imād al-Dīn, on 1 Jumādā II/9 September 1184 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 222).

Miscellaneous events

This year the Chief Shaykh Şadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahīm, son of the Chief Shaykh Ismā‘il, son of the Chief Shaykh Abū Sa‘id, died in Sha‘bān [7 November–5 December 1184]. He had travelled as an envoy of the Caliphal Dīwān to Saladin, accompanied by Shihāb al-Dīn Bashīr the Eunuch, to discuss peace between Saladin and ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul. The two of them came to Damascus, while Saladin was besieging Kerak. They remained until his return but nothing was agreed about peace. They then fell ill and asked to be allowed to return to Iraq. Saladin advised them to remain until they had recovered but they did otherwise and set out in the heat. Bashīr died at Sukhna.⁴ Şadr al-Dīn died at Rahba and was buried in the Shrine of the Trumpet.⁵

He was unique in his time, having combined leadership in both secular and religious matters. He was a refuge for anyone in fear, righteous, generous and mild. He was a man of many virtues. In this last illness of his he used no medicine, trusting in God Almighty.

There died ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Khujandī, the Shāfi‘ī lawyer and headman of Isfahan. He died at the gates of Hamadhan on his return from the Pilgrimage. He is the author of poetry, for example:

In al-Himā is a house that my tears have watered.
O may God water al-Himā, a lovely meadow!
[510]Would that I knew, while hopes are astray,
Whether there is any return to the valley of al-Ghaḍā.
‘Alwa has listened to our calumniator.
There is no blame for ‘Alwa. If only she had not heard,
Or had rightly scrutinized his calumny,
Or forgiven me, for my heart is not with me!

God have mercy on him, be pleased with him and show him His good will.

⁴ Correct: S.ḥ.na. See Krawulsky, 624: ‘on the caravan route from Damascus to Rahba’.

⁵ In Arabic: *mashhad al-būq*. It is outside Rahba, ‘the site at which ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ... encamped when he headed out to do battle with Mu‘āwiya’ (see *Guide to Pilgrimage*, 168–69). According to Ibn al-Qādisī (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iii, 210) Şadr al-Dīn was born in Dhū'l-Ḥijja 508/May 1115 and died in Rajab/8 October–6 November 1184 at Rahba, where he was buried in a domed structure (*qubba*).

Account of Saladin's siege of Mosul and his departure because of the death of Shāh Arman

This year Saladin besieged Mosul for the second time. He marched from Damascus in Dhū'l-Qa'da of the previous year [3 February-4 March 1185]. Having reached Aleppo he remained there until the end of that year and then left and crossed into the lands of al-Jazīra. After arriving at Ḥarrān he arrested Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkburī ibn Zayn al-Dīn, the man who had been behind his acquisition of the Mesopotamian territories.

The reason why he arrested him was that Muẓaffar al-Dīn was all the time writing to Saladin and advising him to attack Mosul, stressing the advantages of this and strengthening his ambition. Eventually he offered him 50,000 dinars if he would come. However, when Saladin came to Ḥarrān,¹ he did not fulfil his promise of money but disavowed it, so Saladin arrested him and put him under guard. Later he freed him and restored to him the two cities of Ḥarrān and Edessa,² which he had taken from him. He only freed him because he feared that people would turn against him in the Mesopotamian lands as they all knew Muẓaffar al-Dīn's role in making him ruler of the Jazīra. That is why he freed him.

In Rabī' I [June 1185] Saladin left Ḥarrān. He was joined by the troops of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā] and Dārā and of Mu'izz al-Dīn Sanjar Shāh, lord of Jazīrat [Ibn 'Umar], who was the nephew of 'Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul. He had abandoned allegiance to his uncle after the arrest of Mujāhid al-Dīn and now marched with Saladin to Mosul. When they arrived at Balad, [512] Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn sent his mother to Saladin along with the daughter of his uncle Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, others of his womenfolk and a number of the notables of his state to ask him to make peace. They offered an alliance and the support of their troops if he would withdraw. He only sent the women because he and all around him thought that, if they asked for Syria, he would grant them their request, especially as the daughter of his master and patron, Nūr al-Dīn, was with them. When they arrived, he provided lodgings for them, summoned his advisors and asked them what he should do and say. Most of them advised that they should be granted what they sought, but the Lawyer 'Isā and 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Mashṭūb, both of them from the Hakkārī lands in the province of Mosul, said, 'The like of Mosul is not given up for a woman. 'Izz al-Dīn has sent them merely because he is too weak to hold the city.'

¹ On 22 Ṣafar/25 May 1185 (Bahā' al-Dīn, 66).

² At the end of 581/early spring 1186 (*Sanā al-barq*, 256).

This agreed with his own inclination so he sent the ladies back disappointed and made various unacceptable excuses. It was not from weakness and feebleness that they were sent, but rather the Atabeg sent them from a wish to avert evil through something better. After they had returned, Saladin marched towards Mosul, confident that he would take the city, but things turned out quite differently. On his approach he camped one league away and his troops extended in that open country to the regions of the Marāqiyya settlement.³ There were some skirmishes between the two armies outside the 'Imadī Gate. At that time I was in Mosul. The common people volunteered their help, angry and wrathful at Saladin's rejection of the women. Saladin met an unexpected reception and was regretful, when regret was useless,⁴ that he had turned the women away, since he had lost his good reputation and chance to control the city. He turned on those, who had advised that the women be repulsed, with blame and reproach.

Letters came to him from al-Qādī al-Fādil and others who had no desire for Mosul, disapproving of what he had done and finding fault with him. Also while he was at Mosul, Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Zayn al-Dīn, the lord of Irbil, came to him. He stationed him along with his brother, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkburī, and other emirs on the eastern side of Mosul and he sent 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Mashṭūb al-Hakkārī away from the camp to the citadel of al-Judayda in the Hakkārī lands. He put it under siege and there gathered [513] around him many Kurds and Hakkārīs. He remained there until Saladin retired from Mosul.

The common people of Mosul used to cross the Tigris, fight the troops on the eastern side and return. During Saladin's seige of Mosul, Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn, its lord, heard that Zulfandār, his lieutenant in the citadel, was in correspondence with him. He prevented him from going up into the citadel and again began to follow the advice of Mujāhid al-Dīn, whom he had driven out, as we have mentioned, and to act upon his opinion. Mujāhid al-Dīn took charge of affairs and mended things that had gone wrong. In the end matters led to peace, as we shall relate, God willing.

A man from Baghdad, who was resident in Mosul, presented himself to Saladin. He came before him and suggested that he divert the course of the Tigris from Mosul towards Nineveh.⁵ He said, 'If the Tigris is diverted from Mosul, the population will be thirsty and we shall conquer it without a fight.' Saladin thought that what he said was credible and determined to do it but finally realized that it would not be possible to divert it entirely, for it would take too long and the labour

³ Unidentified.

⁴ Literally 'as al-Kusa'ī had regretted', a reference to Ghāmid ibn al-Ḥārith al-Kusa'ī, who, when hunting at night, shot five arrows at wild asses and thought that all had missed, so broke his bow. The next day he found the five corpses and his bloodied arrows, and then cut off his thumb (see al-Fayrūzābādī, *Muḥīt*, s.v. *k.s.*).

⁵ According to *Sanā al-barq*, 259 and *Rawḍatayn*, iii, 230, the proposal was made by an unnamed person and a reputed 'engineer', Fakhr al-Dīn Abū Shujā' ibn al-Dahhān al-Baghdādī, was put in charge of the attempted operation.

would be immense with no benefit to follow. His associates expressed their disapproval of the plan so he gave it up.

He remained in his position from the beginning of Rabī‘ II until near its end [2–30 July 1185], then he withdrew towards Mayyāfāriqīn. The reason for this was that Shāh Arman, lord of Khilāt, died there on 9 Rabī‘ II [=11 July].⁶ News of his death arrived on the twentieth of the month⁷ [22 July]. Saladin decided to march there and take it, since Shāh Arman left no son and no member of his family who could rule the city after him. It had been seized by a mamluke of his, named Baktimur, whose title was Sayf [514] al-Dīn. When Saladin consulted his emirs and viziers, they had different opinions. Those who were eager for Mosul advised staying and persevering with the siege but those who deplored any damage done to the Atabeg House advised withdrawal. Saladin said, ‘The realm of Khilāt is greater and more important and it is a stray animal with no keeper. This realm [of Mosul] has a sultan to keep and protect it. If we conquer that other, this and any other will be easy to gain.’ He still hesitated about it but it happened that he received letters from several notables of Khilāt, citizens and emirs, inviting him so that they could hand the city over to him. He therefore set out from Mosul but the writings of these correspondents were a trick and a subterfuge, for Shams al-Dīn Pahlawān ibn Īldikiz, lord of Azerbayjan, Hamadhan and those regions, had already marched against them to take the lands from them. He had previously married Shāh Arman to a daughter of his, despite his great age, to make that a way of taking power in Khilāt and its dependencies. When they heard that he had marched, they wrote to Saladin to invite him to receive the surrender of the city to use him to deter Pahlawān and to use Pahlawān to deter him, while the city remained in their hands. Saladin set out and sent forward in the vanguard his cousin, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shirkūh, and Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Zayn al-Dīn and others. They marched to Khilāt and camped at al-Tayṭuwāna,⁸ close to Khilāt. Saladin went to Mayyāfāriqīn. Pahlawān also marched to Khilāt and camped near it. Envoys of the people of Khilāt went backwards and forwards to Saladin and Pahlawān. Subsequently they came to terms with Pahlawān, joined his alliance and made the khutbah in his name.

Account of the death of Nūr al-Dīn, lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]

This year Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā’ūd, lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]

⁶ *Sanā al-barq*, 259, specifies ‘Thursday’.

⁷ *Sanā al-barq*, 259, gives ‘Saturday 20th’, but this is incompatible with the ‘Thursday’ of the previous note. The 20th would have been a Monday.

⁸ This is the reading of *Sanā al-barq*, 261, a place which Yāqūt, iii, 570, describes as ‘a town in the regions of Armenia’. The reading in *Kāmil* is Tuwāna, a town placed by Yāqūt, iii, 554–5 in Anatolia, which was the ancient Tyana (see Le Strange, *Caliphate*, 136).

and Āmid, died⁹ while Saladin was besieging Mosul. He left two sons and was succeeded [515] by the elder whose name was Suqmān and his title Quṭb al-Dīn. The direction of affairs was undertaken by his vizier, Qiwām al-Dīn ibn Samāqā al-Is‘ardī.¹⁰

Previously ‘Imād al-Dīn¹¹ ibn Qarā Arslān had been sent by his brother Nūr al-Dīn with his troops to Saladin, while he was besieging Mosul. He was with him when he heard the news of his brother’s death, so he set out to take over his lands as his successor because his children were young. That proved impossible for him but he went to Khartbirt and took control there. It remained in his descendants’ hands until the year 620 [1223].

When Saladin besieged Mayyāfāriqīn, Nūr al-Dīn’s son presented himself before him and was confirmed in his father’s realm, including Āmid. They had feared that Saladin might take it from them but he did not. He restored their lands to them, stipulating that they should consult him in the actions they took and obey his commands and prohibitions. He installed alongside him an emir whose title was Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, one of his father’s men.

Account of Saladin’s taking control of Mayyāfāriqīn

When Saladin went to Khilāt, he travelled via Mayyāfāriqīn, which he was eager to take, since its lord, Quṭb al-Dīn, ruler of Mardīn, had died, as we have mentioned, and had been succeeded by his son, still an infant. Shāh Arman had authority there and his troops occupied it. When he died, [Saladin] had ambitions to take it. When he descended upon it, he found it well supplied with men and present too was the wife of the late Quṭb al-Dīn with daughters of hers by him. She was the sister of Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad. Saladin maintained the siege, starting from the beginning of Jumādā I [31 July 1185].

The commander of the local forces was an emir called Asad al-Dīn Yarunqush. He was [516] brave and determined in the excellent way he held the city. The attacks on it became intense and trebuchets and catapults were erected, but Saladin did not attain what he desired. Seeing this, he turned from force and warfare to the employment of guile. He made contact with the widow of Quṭb al-Dīn, resident in the city, saying, ‘Asad al-Dīn Yarunqush has shown an inclination to surrender the city to us. We will respect the rights of your brother through you after his death. We want you to have a share of this matter. I shall marry your daughters to my sons and Mayyāfāriqīn and other places shall be yours and under your authority.’ He then arranged for someone to send to Asad al-Dīn to tell him that the Lady had

⁹ His death date is given as Monday 14 Rabī‘ I/=17 June 1185 (*Sanā al-barq*, 262).

¹⁰ Qiwām al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh was later assassinated because of palace politics on Wednesday 8 Ramadān/=4 December 1185 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 246–7).

¹¹ His personal name was Abū Bakr (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 227).

inclined to make an alliance and submit to the sultan and that the people in Khilāṭ had written to him to surrender to him, so ‘take care for yourself’.

It chanced that an envoy came to Saladin from Khilāṭ with an offer of obedience to him. They repeated their invitation for him to come to them that they had been giving. Saladin ordered this envoy to enter Mayyāfāriqīn who said to Asad al-Dīn, ‘For whom are you fighting? I have come about surrendering Khilāṭ to Saladin.’ He became downcast and his morale weakened. He sent suggesting that he be given a fief and money. This was agreed, so he surrendered the city the last day of Jumādā I [29 August 1185]. Saladin contracted the marriage for one of his sons¹² to one of the Lady’s daughters and confirmed in her hands the castle of al-Hattākh to be her residence, hers and her daughter’s.

Account of Saladin’s return to Mosul and peace between him and Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn

After Saladin had finished the business of Mayyāfāriqīn, firmly established its administration and settled its fiefs and offices, he resolved to return to Mosul. He set out towards it and took his route [517] by Nisibis. He came to Kafar Zammār¹³ when it was winter. He camped there with his troops and had the intention of staying there, assigning all the lands of Mosul in fiefs, taking their crops and revenue and thereby weakening Mosul, when he came to the realization that he was unable to overcome it by force. He had come to camp in Sha‘ban [28 October–25 November 1185] and remained there for Sha‘bān and Ramaḍān [28 October–25 December]. There was an exchange of envoys between Saladin and ‘Izz al-Dīn, lord of Mosul, and Mujāhid al-Dīn came to make the conciliatory approaches. His word was accepted by all the princes because they knew that it was genuine.

While the envoys were going to and fro about peace, Saladin fell ill¹⁴ and withdrew from Kafar Zammār back towards Ḥarrān. The envoys caught up with him with acceptance of his demands, peace was made and his oath given. The terms were that ‘Izz al-Dīn should surrender to him Shahrazūr and its dependencies, the region of al-Qarābulī and all the districts beyond the River Zāb and that the khutbah should be in Saladin’s name on all the pulpits of his lands and the coinage struck in his name. When he had sworn, he sent his envoys who received ‘Izz al-Dīn’s oath and took over the lands whose surrender the peace treaty stipulated.

Saladin arrived at Ḥarrān, where he remained, ill. A state of security reigned, the people at large were quiet and the roots of discord were severed. That came

¹² This was Mu‘izz al-Dīn Ishāq (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 234).

¹³ One of the villages of Mosul (*Yāqūt*, iv, 469).

¹⁴ His illness began on Wednesday 8 Ramaḍān/=4 December 1185 (*Sanā al-barq*, 267).

about through the intermediary efforts of Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz (God have mercy on him).

Saladin remained ill for a long time at Harrān. The members of his family present with him were his brother al-‘Ādil, who at that time held Aleppo, and his son al-‘Azīz ‘Uthmān. His illness became serious, so that they despaired of his recovery. He made his people swear an oath to his sons and assigned to each of them a specified part of his lands. He appointed his brother al-‘Ādil guardian of them all. Later he recovered and returned to Damascus in Muḥarram of the year 582 [24 March-22 April 1186].

During his illness at Harrān his cousin, Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shirkūh was with him. [518] The fief he held was Homs and Rahba. He left Saladin and went to Homs, passing by Aleppo, where he summoned a group of the militia and gave them money. Having arrived at Homs, he wrote to several of the men of Damascus and made an agreement with them for the surrender of the city to him, if Saladin should die. He remained at Homs, waiting for him to die to go to Damascus and take power there. However, Saladin recovered and this report came to his ears in all its details.¹⁵ Only a little time later Ibn Shirkūh died on the eve of the Feast of Sacrifice¹⁶ [= 3 March 1186]. He drank wine, indulging excessively and by the morning he was dead. Some have related – and the responsibility for this is theirs – that Saladin arranged for a man, called al-Nāṣih ibn al-‘Amīd, who was from Damascus, to go to him, carouse with him and give him a poisoned drink. Come the morning, al-Nāṣih was nowhere to be seen. They asked after him and were told, ‘During the night he went to Saladin’. This was one of the things that strengthened suspicions.¹⁷ After his death, Saladin gave his fief to his son Shirkūh, who was twelve years of age. Nāṣir al-Dīn left a great amount of money, numerous horses and equipment. Saladin came to Homs and reviewed his estate. He took most of it and left only what was no good.

I have heard that Shirkūh ibn Nāṣir al-Dīn came to Saladin a year after the death of his father. Saladin said to him, ‘Where have you got to in the Koran?’ He replied, ‘Up to where God Almighty says, “Those who consume the property of orphans wickedly merely consume fire in their bellies and will burn in Hellfire.”’¹⁸ Saladin and those present were astonished at his astuteness.

¹⁵ In Arabic ‘alā jihatihī. The meaning is not sure; cf. ‘alā wajhihi in Dozy, *Supplément*, ii, 793.

¹⁶ i.e. 10 Dhū'l-Ḥijja. Al-Qādī al-Fāḍil (quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iii, 244-5) gives the date Sunday 9 Dhū'l-Ḥijja/= 2 March 1186.

¹⁷ ‘Imād al-Dīn writes only of the complete unexpectedness of his death (*Sanā al-barq*, 272).

¹⁸ Koran, iv, 10.

[519] Account of the strife between the Turkomans and the Kurds in the Jazīra and at Mosul

During this year there was the beginning of the strife between the Turkomans and the Kurds in the Jazīra, Mosul, Diyār Bakr, Khilāt, Syria, Shahrazūr and Azerbayjan. Because of it a multitude beyond counting were killed. It lasted several years. Roads were made impassable, property plundered and much blood spilt.

It was caused in the following way. A Turkoman woman married a Turkoman and in their travels they passed a castle in Zawzān belonging to the Kurds. Its inhabitants came and demanded a wedding feast from the Turkomans, who refused. An argument ensued which ended in blows. The lord of that castle came down, arrested the husband and put him to death, which led to an outbreak of violence. The Turkomans went on to a war footing and killed a large number of Kurds. The Kurds reacted fiercely and likewise killed many Turkomans. The evil grew alarmingly and persisted.

Subsequently, Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz (God have mercy on him) gathered together a number of the chiefs of the Kurds and the Turkomans and made peace between them. He bestowed on them robes of honour, gowns and the like and expended a great sum of money on them. The strife was stopped and God dealt with the evil of it. The people returned to their former calm and security.

How the Almoravids and the Arabs took Ifrīqiya and how it was restored to the Almohads

Under the year 580 [1184-85] we have already mentioned ‘Alī ibn Ishāq the Almoravid’s conquest of Bougie and how Ya’qūb ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Mu’mīn, the ruler of the Maghrib, sent troops and recovered it. ‘Alī went to [520] Ifrīqiya and on his arrival Sulaym, Riyāḥ and the Arabs there united and were joined by the Turks who had entered that region from Egypt with Qarāqūsh. We have already mentioned his arrival there. Among the Turks from Egypt who came on the scene was also a mamluke of Taqī al-Dīn, the nephew of Saladin, called Būz-Aba. Their band grew large and their offensive power increased. When they gathered together, their numbers reached a large total and everyone of them hated the Almohad regime. All obediently followed ‘Alī ibn Ishāq the Almoravid because he was of the house of kingship and ancient leadership. They gave him the title ‘Commander of the Muslims’.

They attacked Ifrīqiya and took it all, except for the two cities of Tunis and Mahdiyya. The Almohads remained there and held both despite fear, blockade and hardship. The rebel Almoravid was joined by every trouble-maker in that region and those who intended strife, plundering, wickedness and evil. They ruined towns, fortresses and villages, ravished women and cut down trees.

The governor of Ifrīqiya at that time was ‘Abd al-Wāhid ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hintātī, based in Tunis. He sent to the ruler of the Maghrib, Ya‘qūb, who was in Marrakech, to inform him of the situation. Meanwhile, the Almoravid attacked the peninsula (*jazīra*) of Bāshshū,¹⁹ which is near Tunis and contains many settlements. He descended upon them and encompassed them, so that the inhabitants asked for terms, which were granted. When the troops entered, they plundered all the money, animals and crops that were there. They robbed the people, even taking their clothes. Violent hands were laid on women and children, whom they left utterly destroyed. They then attacked Tunis. The strong were in service and doing tasks that provided their sustenance but the weak sought handouts and begged from others. The season of winter came upon them [521] and they perished from the cold. Sickness broke out among them and their dead were beyond counting. They reached 12,000 and that was in one place. One can imagine what happened to the rest.

When the Almoravid took control of Ifrīqiya, he suppressed the khutbah in the name of ‘Abd al-Mu’min’s descendants and proclaimed the name of the Imam al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, the Abbasid caliph, to whom he sent requesting robes of investiture and black banners.

In the year 582 [1186–87] he attacked the city of Gafsa and put it under siege. The inhabitants drove out the Almohad troops of the son of ‘Abd al-Mu’min and surrendered the city to the Almoravid, who stationed Almoravid and Turkish troops there and garrisoned it with men, in addition to its being impregnably built.

When Ya‘qūb ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd Mu’min received this news, he selected from his army 20,000 Almohad horsemen, intentionally keeping his force small because of the scarcity of provisions in the land, owing to the destruction and damage that had occurred, and set out in Ṣafar 583 [12 April–10 May 1187]. He came to the city of Tunis and dispatched 6,000 horse with his nephew. They marched to give battle to ‘Alī ibn Ishāq the Almoravid, who was at Gafsa. When they encountered him, there were with the Almohads a detachment of Turks, who changed sides. The Almohads were defeated and a number of their captains were killed. That was in Rabī’ I 583 [11 May–9 June 1187].

When Ya‘qūb heard this news, he remained in Tunis until the middle of Rajab that year [6 September–5 October 1187] and then set out with his troops to seek out the Almoravid and the Turks. He reached them and met in battle near the city of Qabès. The Almoravid and his men were defeated and the Almohads did much slaughter, almost exterminating them. Only a few escaped, who made for the open countryside. Ya‘qūb straightaway returned to Qabès, took it and seized Qarāqūsh’s

¹⁹ Correct the edition’s Bāsh.rā (cf. the variant in its note 3). See *Miḍmār*, 202–3: Bāshshū, a fertile district of Tunis with 1,000 villages. It is the peninsula between the gulfs of La Goulette and al-Ḥammāt with Cap Bon as its northernmost point. It was generally known as Jazīrat Sharīk but Idrīsī called it Jazīrat Bāshshū after its then biggest town. See *EI*(2), ii, 538–9 and Cornu, *Atlas*, 111.

womenfolk and children, whom he took to Marrakech. He moved to Gafsa and besieged it for three months. He cut down trees and ruined its surroundings. The Turks there sent to him, asking for terms for themselves and the people [522] of the town. He granted their request and the Turks left in safety. He sent them to the frontiers because he saw their bravery and the damage they could do to the enemy. Ya'qūb took over the city and killed the Almoravids there. He demolished its walls and left it like a village. What the Mahdi Ibn Tūmart had warned of came to pass, for he had said, 'Its walls will be demolished and its trees cut down'. This has been mentioned before.²⁰ When Ya'qūb had finished his business at Gafsa and Ifrīqiya had become settled, he returned to Marrakech, where he arrived in the year 584 [1188].²¹

Miscellaneous events

This year Rađī al-Dīn Abū'l-Khayr Ismā'īl al-Qazwīnī, the Shāfi'i lawyer, left Baghdad, where he was professor at the Niżāmiyya, and returned to Qazwīn. His successor as professor was the Shaykh Abū Ṭālib al-Mubārak, the pupil of Ibn al-Khall,²² and he had been a righteous scholar.

This year there was great strife between the inhabitants of Karkh at Baghdad and those of the Basra Gate. Many were wounded or killed. The syndic, al-Zāhir, made peace between them.

There died this year the lawyer Muhadhdhib al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn As'ad al-Mawṣilī. He was learned in the law school of al-Shāfi'i. He is the author of some good verse and of some prose in which he excelled. He was one of the ornaments of the age. His death occurred in Homs.

²⁰ See above p. [244].

²¹ For the background to the events in this section, see Le Tourneau, *Almohad Movement*, 72–4.

²² al-Mubārak ibn al-Mubārak, Abū Ṭālib al-Karkhī, a Shāfi'i lawyer (died 585/1189), see *Wāfi*, xxv, 99–100. His teacher, known as Ibn al-Khall, was Abū'l-Hasan Muḥammad ibn al-Mubārak ibn Muḥammad al-'Ukbarī (died 552/1157), see *Muntazam*, x, 179–80; *Wāfi*, iv, 381.

**Account of al-‘Ādil’s transfer from Aleppo and of al-‘Azīz’s to Egypt,
the removal of al-Afḍal from Egypt to Damascus and the assignment
of the latter to him as a fief**

During this year Saladin removed his son, al-Afḍal ‘Alī, from Egypt to Damascus and assigned it to him as a fief. He took Aleppo from his brother al-‘Ādil¹ and sent him with another son of his, al-‘Azīz ‘Uthmān, to Egypt, appointing him as al-‘Azīz’s lieutenant there, and recalled Taqī al-Dīn.

The reason for this was that he had appointed Taqī al-Dīn as his representative in Egypt, as we have related, and placed with him his eldest son, al-Afḍal ‘Alī. Taqī al-Dīn sent complaints about al-Afḍal, stating that he had made it impossible for him to collect taxes, because he was mild and generous; whenever Taqī al-Dīn² wanted to punish anyone, he would stop him. Saladin summoned his son al-Afḍal and said to Taqī al-Dīn, ‘Do not plead some justification over the taxes or anything else.’³ His feelings towards him changed because of this. He suspected that he wanted to remove his son al-Afḍal to be on his own in Egypt, so that he could seize power there when Saladin died. When this notion became strong in his mind, he summoned his brother al-‘Ādil from Aleppo and sent him to Egypt with his son al-‘Azīz ‘Uthmān.⁴ He called Taqī al-Dīn to Syria but he refused to attend on him and gathered levies and troops to go to the Maghrib to join his mamluke Qarāqūsh. The latter had already taken control of the Nafūsa Mountain,⁵ [524] Barqa⁶ and elsewhere and had written to him, encouraging him to take an interest in those regions. He therefore made his preparations for the expedition and surrounded himself with brave troops, gathering many of them.

Saladin was displeased to hear this but knew that, if he sent to stop him, he would not comply. He sent to say to him, ‘I wish you to come to me so that I may bid you farewell and recommend to you what you should do.’ When he presented himself to him,⁷ Saladin detained him but gave him a larger fief, which now

¹ Saladin assigned Aleppo to his son al-Zāhir Ghāzī (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 257).

² He came to Damascus on Monday 23 Jumādā I/11 August 1186 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 255).

³ *Sanā al-barq*, 279, makes it clear that Saladin wrote to Taqī al-Dīn (still in Egypt) and gave him reason to believe that he would be in sole charge of Egypt.

⁴ They arrived at Cairo on 5 Ramaḍān/19 November 1186 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 257).

⁵ An escarpment which runs south-westwardly from the coast of present-day Libya just west of al-Khums to Nalut on the Tunisian border. See *EI*(2), vii, 894-5.

⁶ Otherwise the region of Cyrenaica, the bulge between the Gulfs of Bomba and Syrte, with the Jabl al-Akhdar to the north (*EI*(2), i, 1048-50).

⁷ At the end of Sha‘bān/14 November 1186 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 257).

comprised Hama, Manbij, Ma‘arrat [al-Nu‘mān], Kafartāb, Mayyāfāriqīn, Mount Jūr and all their dependencies. Taqī al-Dīn had sent on his mamluke Būz-Aba with his advance guard. He made contact with Qarāqūsh and the sequel was what we have related under the year 581 [1185–86].

I have heard from someone well informed about Saladin’s affairs that he was persuaded to take Aleppo from al-‘Ādil and bring Taqī al-Dīn back to Syria just because, when he fell ill at Harrān, as we have mentioned, there were rumours in Egypt that he had died and on Taqī al-Dīn’s part several initiatives were taken as of one who planned to seize power for himself. When Saladin was restored to health, he heard of this and sent the Lawyer ‘Īsā al-Hakkārī, who was in high standing with Saladin and obeyed by the army, to Egypt and ordered him to send Taqī al-Dīn out and to remain himself in Egypt. He travelled with all speed and before Taqī al-Dīn was aware of it the Lawyer ‘Īsā had entered his residence in Cairo and sent orders for him to leave. He asked to be given time to prepare for the journey but ‘Īsā did not allow it. He said, ‘Remain outside the city and get ready there.’ Taqī al-Dīn left and announced that he intended to make his way to the Maghrib. ‘Īsā said to him, ‘Go wherever you want.’ However, when Saladin heard the news, he sent demanding his presence, so he went to Syria. Saladin treated him kindly and did not reveal to him any of his feelings because he was forebearing, generous and long-suffering (God have mercy on him).

As for Aleppo’s being taken from al-‘Ādil, this came about as follows. Among the troops of Aleppo there was a great emir, named Sulaymān ibn Jandar, between whom and Saladin there was an old friendship dating from before his coming to power. Saladin relied upon him, for he was wise, cunning and astute. It came about that, when al-‘Ādil was in Aleppo, Saladin did not treat him according to his expectations and gave others precedence over him. [525] He was much affected by this.

After Saladin had been ill and recovered, he went to Syria. One day Sulaymān bin Jandar went riding with him and they talked of his illness. Sulaymān said to him, ‘By what reasoning did you think that you could go hunting and that they would not disagree with you?’⁸ By Allāh, are you not ashamed that a bird finds its way to its own interest better than you do?’ Saladin said, ‘How is that?’ laughing the while. ‘When a bird wishes to make a nest for its chicks,’ he replied, ‘it seeks out the tops of the trees to protect its brood. You have handed over the fortresses to your [wider] family and put your sons on the ground. There is Aleppo in your brother’s hands, Hama in the hands of Taqī al-Dīn, Homs in the hands of Ibn Shirkūh and your son al-‘Azīz with Taqī al-Dīn in Egypt, who can remove him whenever he wishes. And there is your other son, your brother has him in his tents, able to treat him as he wishes.’ Saladin said, ‘You are right. Keep this matter

⁸ Clearly the reorganization of the state is concerned but the sentence is not entirely clear. In *Rawdatayn*, iii, 268, we read: ‘During the rest of the year 582 at Damascus the sultan was occupied with hunting and hawking.’

secret.' Subsequently he took Aleppo from his brother and removed Taqī al-Dīn from Egypt. Then he gave Harrān, Edessa and Mayyāfāriqīn to his brother al-Ādil to remove him from Syria and Egypt, that they might remain his sons' possessions. What he did was of no use to him, since God Almighty willed the transference of sovereignty away from his sons, as we shall narrate.

Account of the death of Pahlawān and the succession of his brother Qizil

At the beginning of this year [began 24 March 1186] Pahlawān Muḥammad ibn Īldikiz, the ruler of the Uplands, Rayy, Isfahan, Azerbayjan, Arrāniyya and other territories, died. He was a just man, of good conduct, wise and mild and of excellent practice in ruling. His lands were secure during his reign and his subjects quietly peaceful. After his death there occurred in Isfahan between the Shāfi‘īs and Ḥanafīs battles, killings, burnings and plunderings that beggar description. The local cadi was head of the Ḥanafīs and Ibn al-Khujandī head of the Shāfi‘īs. In the city of Rayy there was [526] also serious rioting between the Sunnis and the Shia. Its population was scattered and some were killed. The city was ruined, as were others.

After the death of Pahlawān his brother Qizil Arslān, whose personal name was ‘Uthmān, succeeded. Under Pahlawān's control was the Sultan Ṭughril ibn Arslān ibn Ṭughril ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, who was proclaimed as sultan in the khutbah throughout the land. He had no actual power. The land, the emirs and the finances were under Pahlawān's authority. After Pahlawān's death Ṭughril escaped from Qizil's control and was joined by several emirs and troops. He seized part of the country and battles followed between him and Qizil, as we shall relate, God willing.

Account of a dispute among the Franks in Syria and the alliance of the Count, lord of Tripoli, with Saladin

The Count, lord of Tripoli, whose name was Raymond, son of Raymond of St Gilles, had married the Countess, lady of Tiberias. He moved to live with her there at Tiberias. Then the king of the Franks in Syria, who was a leper, died and willed the kingdom to a nephew of his, who was a child.⁹ The Count became his guardian and undertook the rule and administration of the kingdom, because at that time the Franks had nobody more influential than him, none braver and none more excellent in counsel. Because of this child he was ambitious to be king. It then chanced that the child died and sovereignty passed to his mother. What the Count had been contemplating in his heart came to nothing.

⁹ Baldwin IV's sister, Sybilla, had a child by William of Montferrat, who ruled for a short time as Baldwin V and died aged seven.

[527] This royal lady fell in love with a Frank, one of those who came to Syria from the west, whose name was Guy.¹⁰ She married him and so transferred kingship to him and placed the crown on his head. She summoned the Patriarch, the priests and monks, the Hospitallers, the Templars and the barons and informed them that she had handed royal power to him, making them her witnesses to that. So they obeyed him and submitted to him. This the Count found outrageous and he was crestfallen. He was then called to account for the money he had collected during his regency for that child. He maintained that he had spent it on him and all this made him more estranged. He made his differences and his opposition very plain. He made contact with Saladin, allied himself to him for his support and asked him for help in attaining what he aimed at from the Franks. Saladin along with the Muslims rejoiced at this and promised him aid and help to gain all that he wanted. He guaranteed that he would make him an independent ruler for all the Franks. He held several of the Count's knights as prisoners and these he released. This made a very great impression on the Count, who gave open allegiance to Saladin.¹¹ Several of the Franks followed his course of action. Thus their unity was disrupted and their cohesion broken. This was one of the most important factors that brought about the conquest of their territories and the liberation of Jerusalem, as we shall relate, if God wills.

Saladin sent out squadrons from the region of Tiberias, which carried out raids on Frankish lands. They came back safe and full of booty. This all undermined the Franks, leaving them weak. The Muslims became bold and eager to confront them.

Account of the treachery of Prince Reynald

Prince Reynald, lord of Kerak, was one of the greatest and wickedest of the Franks, the most hostile to the Muslims and the most dangerous to them. Aware of this, Saladin targeted him with blockades time after time and raided his territory occasion after occasion. [528] As a result he was abashed and humbled and asked Saladin for a truce, which was granted. The truce was made and duly sworn to. Caravans then went back and forth between Syria and Egypt.

This year a large caravan, rich in goods and with many men, accompanied by a good number of soldiers, passed by him. The accursed one treacherously seized every last man and made their goods, animals and weapons his booty. Those he made captive he consigned to his prisons. Saladin sent blaming him, deplored his treacherous action and threatening him if he did not release the captives and the goods, but he would not agree to do that and persisted in his refusal. Saladin vowed

¹⁰ i.e. Guy of Lusignan.

¹¹ *Sanā al-barq*, 289: 'Had it not been for fear of his co-religionists, the Count would have converted to Islam and become a resident in the lands ruled by the sultan.'

that, if he ever had him in his power, he would kill him. The sequel we shall narrate, God willing.

Miscellaneous events

The astrologers in ancient and recent times had predicted that this year on 29 Jumādā II [16 September 1186] the five planets would come together in the sign of the Balance and that with their conjunction severe winds would occur and dust [storms] that would destroy the people and ruin the land. When this year arrived, there was no truth in this; no winds blew at all, indeed it transpired that the completion of the wheat and barley harvest was delayed because of the lack of wind to allow the peasants to winnow. God gave the lie to the words of the astrologers and shamed them.

During this year ‘Abd Allāh ibn Birrī ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn Birrī, the Egyptian grammarian, died.¹² He was an outstanding authority in grammar (God Almighty have mercy on him).

¹² On 27 Shawwāl/10 January 1187 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 267).

The beginning of this year fell on a Saturday¹ and it was the royal [Persian] New Year's Day and 14 Ādhār [March] of the year 1498 in the Alexandrian era. The moon and the sun were in Aries. The beginning of the Arab [Muslim] year and the beginning of the Persian year, which had been reintroduced recently, and the beginning of the Byzantine year all coincided. The sun and the moon were in the first of the zodiacal signs. The reoccurrence of the same is a long way off.

Account of Saladin's siege of Kerak

This year Saladin wrote to all his lands, summoning men to the Jihad. He wrote to Mosul, the Mesopotamian regions, Irbil and other places in the east and to Egypt and all of Syria, calling upon them to engage in the Jihad and ordering them to make all possible preparations. He left Damascus at the end of Muḥarram [ended 10 April 1187]² with his own special troop and came to Ra's al-Mā', where the Syrian contingents joined him. When they had gathered, he put his son al-Afḍal 'Alī in charge of them, so that other arrivals could assemble around him and he himself travelled to Buṣrā without the baggage train.

The reason for his march to that destination was that news came to him that Prince Reynald, [530] lord of Kerak, was planning to attack the pilgrims to catch them on their route and had made clear his intention, when he had dealt with the pilgrims, to return to the Egyptian army's route and prevent them from joining Saladin. He therefore went to Buṣrā to prevent Prince Reynald from pursuing the pilgrims and to force him to stay in his town, out of anxiety for it.

Among the pilgrims were several of Saladin's relatives, including Muḥammad ibn Lājīn,³ a nephew of his, among others. When Reynald heard of Saladin's approach to his lands, he put off his departure and dropped the plan he was eager for, so the pilgrims arrived safely. After they had arrived and his worries on their account were over, Saladin set out for Kerak and subjected it to a close siege, while awaiting the arrival of the Egyptian army. When they had joined him at Kerak, he dispatched his squadrons against the lordship of Kerak and Shawbak and

¹ Saturday 13 March 1187. Note the inconsistent '14 Ādhār' just below.

² Saladin left Damascus on Saturday 1 Muḥarram/=14 March 1187 (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 276).

³ Ḥusām al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn Lājīn was accompanied by his mother, a sister of Saladin (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 276). On several occasions in different texts Ḥusām al-Dīn is called 'Umar (not Muḥammad). Once (a misprint?), he is called 'Umar ibn Muḥammad ibn Lājīn (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 316).

elsewhere to plunder, destroy and burn, while the Prince was besieged, unable to defend his territory, and the rest of the Franks were confined within their own lands for fear of the army that was with his son al-Afdal. Thus there was the opportunity to blockade, plunder, burn and destroy and this is what Saladin did.

Account of the raid on the region of Acre

Saladin sent to his son al-Afdal ordering him to send a good-sized detachment of his army to the region of Acre, to plunder and destroy. He dispatched Muzaffar al-Dīn Kūkbūrī ibn Zayn al-Dīn, lord of Ḥarrān and Edessa, and seconded to him Qāymāz al-Najmī and Dildirim al-Yārūqī, both of them senior emirs, and others. They left by night and in the morning [531] reached Ṣaffūriyya towards the end of Ṣafar [ended 10 May 1187]. The Franks came out to confront them with a body of Templars, Hospitallers and others. They met and there was a battle fit to turn black hair gray.

God Almighty sent down His aid upon the Muslims and the Franks were routed, several of them being killed and the rest taken prisoner. Among the slain was the master of the Hospitallers,⁴ who was one of the renowned knights of the Franks and the cause of great damage to the Muslims. The latter ravaged the lands adjacent to them, taking plunder and captives, and then returned safely. Their return was by way of Tiberias, where the Count was, but he did not object to this. It was a great triumph, for the Templars and the Hospitallers are the Franks' firebrands. Victorious communiqués were sent to the lands to announce this news.

Account of Saladin's return to his army and his incursion against the Franks

When Saladin received the good news about the defeat of the Hospitallers and Templars and the account of who was slain and who made prisoner, he withdrew from Kerak to join the force that was with his son al-Afdal. All the rest of the reinforcements and contingents had come together and united. They all paraded and the army was reviewed. They numbered 12,000 cavalry, fief-holders or salaried men, apart from the volunteers. Saladin drew up his army with a centre and two wings, left and right, an advance guard and a rear guard. Every man knew his position and his place and was ordered to maintain it. He marched in battle order and camped at Uq̄huwāna near Tiberias. The count had allied himself with Saladin, as we have mentioned, and his letters were constantly arriving with the promise of support and offering aid. The Devil only promises to deceive.

⁴ Roger des Moulins.

⁵ The region at the base of Lake Tiberias, sometimes called al-Qaḥwāna (known to the Crusaders as Cavan).

When the Franks saw the concentration of the Islamic forces and their firm determination to invade their lands, [532] they sent the Patriarch, priests and monks and many knights to the Count and they censured him for his alliance with Saladin, saying, ‘There is no doubt that you have become a Muslim, otherwise you could not have endured what the Muslims did to the Franks recently, killing the Templars and Hospitallers, taking them captive and leading them past you, while you made no objection and did not stop it.’ His own men, soldiers of Tiberias and Tripoli, agreed with them and the Patriarch threatened to excommunicate him and declare his wife’s marriage invalid and made other threats. When the Count saw the seriousness of his position, he was fearful, made excuses, renounced [his recent course] and repented. They accepted his excuses and forgave his faults and asked him to stand against the Muslims and to help them defend their lands. He responded that he would make peace and join them in their ranks. Thereupon he travelled with them to the King of the Franks and their unity of word was restored after dissension. None of this was any use to them with God. They collected their horse and their foot, then marched from Acre to Ṣaffūriyya, taking one step forwards and another backwards, their hearts filled with fear.

Account of Saladin’s conquest of Tiberias

After the Franks had assembled and marched to Ṣaffūriyya, Saladin brought together his emirs and viziers for a consultation. Most of them advised him to avoid a major encounter and to weaken the Franks by carrying out raids and destroying their states successively. One of the emirs said to him, ‘The best plan in my opinion is for us to invade their territory, plunder and destroy, burn and take captives. If any Frankish force stands against us, we should meet it. People in the east curse us and say, “He has given up fighting the infidels and has turned his attention to fighting Muslims.” In my opinion our best plan is to take a course of action that will vindicate us and stop people’s tongues.’ Saladin replied, ‘In my view our best course is to meet with our full complement [533] of Muslims the full force of the infidels. Affairs do not proceed by man’s decision. We do not know how much remains of our lives. It is only fitting to disperse this host after it has done its best in the Jihad.’

He moved from Uq̄huwāna on the fifth day after camping there, which was Thursday with seven days remaining of Rabī‘ II [2 July 1187]. He marched until he had left Tiberias behind his back and climbed into its mountain, advancing until he drew near the Franks but saw none of them as they did not leave their tents. He camped and ordered the army to do the same. When night fell, he stationed men opposite the Franks to prevent any forceful progress and descended without his baggage train to Tiberias which he attacked. He mined one of the towers and took the town by force of arms during a single night. The defenders sought refuge in its

citadel and resisted there, where were the chatelaine and her children. Saladin sacked and burnt the town.

When the Franks heard of Saladin's descent on Tiberias, his capture and sack of the town, its being torched and the burning of whatever was left that could not be carried away, they assembled for consultation. Some of them advised advancing on the Muslims, bringing them to battle and driving them from Tiberias. However, the Count said, 'Tiberias is mine and my wife's.⁶ Saladin has already done to the city what he has done. The citadel remains and my wife is in it. I would be happy if he took the citadel, my wife and our possessions there and retired. By God, I have seen the armies of Islam both in the past and recently but I have never seen such a numerous and powerful army as Saladin has. If he takes Tiberias, he will not be able to stay there. When he leaves and retires, we shall recover it. If he does stay there, he will only be able to do so with all his forces and they will be unable to endure the long time away from their homes and families, so he will be compelled to leave and we will ransom our people who have been taken prisoner.'

The lord of Kerak, Prince Reynald, said to him, 'That is enough making us frightened of the Muslims! There is no doubt that you are on their side and favour them, otherwise you would not have spoken so. As for what you say, they are indeed numerous but fire is not harmed by an abundance of firewood.' The Count replied, 'I am one of you. If you advance, I shall advance and if you withdraw, I shall withdraw. [534] You will see what will happen.'

They determined to advance against the Muslims and bring them to battle. They moved out of their camp which they had clung to and drew near the forces of Islam. When Saladin heard of this, he came back from Tiberias to his army which was close by. His purpose in besieging Tiberias had only been that the Franks should leave their position so that he could engage them. The Muslims had camped where there was a spring, it being high summer and extremely hot. The Franks experienced thirst and were unable to reach that spring because of the Muslims, who had destroyed what cistern water there was. However, the enemy were unable to retire because of their fear of the Muslims. They remained where they were until the following day, a Saturday [4 July], having suffered much from thirst.

The Muslims were eager to attack them, although previously fearful of them. They spent the night, encouraging one another, having caught a whiff of triumph and victory. The more they saw the state of the Franks, unlike their customary state because of the dismay that overwhelmed them, the more eager and bold they became. All through the night they frequently proclaimed 'God is great' and 'There is no god but God'. During that night the sultan organized the advance guard and distributed arrows amongst them.

⁶ His wife was Eschiva of Bures, princess of Galilee and lady of Tiberias.

Account of the defeat of the Franks at Hattīn

The morning of Saturday five days from the end of Rabī‘ II [4 July 1187] Saladin and the Muslims mounted up and advanced towards the Franks, who also went to horse. They drew close to one another. However, the Franks suffered intense thirst and were in low spirits. Battle was joined and became fierce but both sides held firm. The Muslim advance guard shot arrows that were like a swarm of locusts [535] and killed many of the Franks. This engagement took place after the Franks had grouped themselves with their infantry and while they fought on the march, making for Tiberias in the hope that they might reach water.

When Saladin realized their intention, he blocked their fulfilment of it; he stood with his army face to face with them and personally toured the Muslim ranks to encourage them, ordering what would be best for them and forbidding what would be detrimental. The men obeyed his instructions and observed his prohibitions.

One of his young mamlukes made an extraordinary charge against the Frankish line. He fought in a manner that astonished our men, but the Franks overwhelmed and slew him. When he was killed, the Muslims made a formidable charge. They weakened the infidels and killed many of them. Seeing the seriousness of the situation, the Count realized that they were not strong enough to resist the Muslims. He and his followers agreed to charge those nearest them. The commander of the Muslims in that sector was Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar, Saladin’s nephew. When he saw the Franks charge in such a desperate fashion, he knew that there was no possibility of standing firm to face them, so he ordered his men to open a path for them by which they could leave the field. This they did and the Count and his men rode away. The ranks were then closed again.

Some of the Muslim volunteer fighters had set fire to the ground there. The grass was abundant and the fire spread. The wind was against the Franks and it carried the heat and smoke of the fire towards them. Thirst, the hot weather, the heat of the fire, the smoke and the heat of the battle all combined against them. When the Count fled, their spirits collapsed and they were near to surrendering. Then they understood that they would only be saved from death by facing it boldly, so they carried out successive charges, which almost drove the Muslims from their positions despite their numbers, had it not been for God’s grace. However, the Franks did not charge and retire without suffering losses and they were gravely weakened by that. The Muslims surrounded them as a circle encloses its central point. The surviving Franks climbed up to a hill in the district of Hattīn and intended [536] to erect their tents and protect themselves there. They were attacked fiercely from all sides and prevented from doing what they planned. They were unable to erect any tent other than the tent of their king. The Muslims captured their great cross which they call the True Cross,⁷ claiming that it contains a part of the wooden structure on which the Messiah (on him be peace) was crucified, as

⁷ In Arabic *salīb al-ṣalbūt* (literally ‘the cross of the crucifixion’).

they assert. The seizure of it was one of their greatest misfortunes, after which they were sure they were doomed to death and destruction. Meanwhile, slaughter and capture were at work among their knights and infantry. The king remained on the hill with about 150 of his renowned knights and noted warriors.

Saladin's son, al-Afdal, told me the following:

I was alongside my father during this battle, the first I had witnessed. When the king of the Franks was on the hill with that band, they made a formidable charge against the Muslims facing them, so that they drove them back to my father. I looked towards him and he was overcome by grief and his complexion pale. He took hold of his beard and advanced, crying out 'Give the lie to the Devil'. The Muslims rallied, returned to the fight and climbed the hill. When I saw that the Franks withdrew, pursued by the Muslims, I shouted for joy, 'We have beaten them!' But the Franks rallied and charged again like the first time and drove the Muslims back to my father. He acted as he had on the first occasion and the Muslims turned upon the Franks and drove them back to the hill. I again shouted, 'We have beaten them!' but my father rounded on me and said, 'Be quiet! We have not beaten them until that tent falls.' As he was speaking to me, the tent fell. The sultan dismounted, prostrated himself in thanks to God Almighty and wept for joy.

The reason for its fall was that the Franks, when they had made these charges, became ever more thirsty. They had hoped through one of these charges to escape from the situation they were in, but when they found no [537] way of escape, they dismounted and sat down on the ground. The Muslims climbed up to them and cast down the king's tent. They took every last man of them prisoner, including the king, his brother, Prince Reynald lord of Kerak, than whom there was no Frank more hostile to the Muslims. They also captured the lord of Jubayl,⁸ the son of Humphrey, the master of the Templars,⁹ who was one of the most important Franks, and a number of Templars and a number of Hospitallers. Many Franks had been killed or taken prisoner. Seeing the slain, you would not imagine that anyone had been taken alive, while seeing the captives, you would think that none could have been killed. Since the Franks appeared on the coast in the year 491 [1098] they had not suffered such a reverse.

When the Muslims had done with them, Saladin sat in his tent and summoned the Frankish king and the Prince, lord of Kerak. He gave a seat beside him to the king, who was near dead from thirst, and offered him iced water which he drank from and then gave what was left to the lord of Kerak. Saladin said, 'Not with my permission did this accursed man drink water and so gain my safe-conduct.' Then he addressed the Prince and berated him for his sins and rehearsed his treacherous

⁸ Hugh II Embriaco.

⁹ Gerard of Ridfort.

deeds. He then rose to face him and struck off his head. He said, ‘Twice have I vowed to kill him if I had him in my power; once when he wished to march on Mecca and Medina and again when he treacherously seized the caravan.’¹⁰ After he was killed and dragged away, the king trembled with fear but Saladin calmed his terrors and gave him a guarantee of safety.

As for the Count, lord of Tripoli, after he had escaped from the battle, as we have mentioned, [538] he came to Tyre and then made for Tripoli. After only a few days he died from grief and bitter anger at what had befallen the Franks in particular and the religion of Christianity in general.

Account of Saladin's return to Tiberias and his taking of the citadel along with the town

After Saladin had achieved the defeat of the Franks, he remained where he was for the remainder of the day. On the Sunday morning [5 July] he returned to Tiberias and camped around it. The chatelaine sent requesting terms for herself, her children, her followers and her possessions. He granted this and she left with everything. He kept his word to her and she left in security. Then he gave orders for the king and all the company of notable prisoners to be sent to Damascus. He also ordered the Templars and the Hospitallers who had been taken to be gathered together for execution. He learnt that those who held one of these prisoners would not let him go because of the ransom they hoped for. Therefore for every prisoner in these two categories Saladin offered fifty Egyptian dinars. Immediately 200 prisoners were brought to him and he ordered their heads to be struck off. He singled these out for execution because they were the fiercest fighters of all the Franks. He wished to rid the Muslims of their wickedness. He wrote to his lieutenant in Damascus, instructing him to kill those of them who had entered the city, whether they were his or anyone else's. This was carried out. About two years later I passed by the site of the battle and saw the ground covered with their bones, visible from afar, some of them heaped up and others scattered about and this was apart from those that torrents had swept away or wild beasts in those thickets and hollows had taken.

[539] Account of the conquest of the city of Acre

After Saladin had finished with Tiberias, he left it on the Tuesday [7 July] and arrived at Acre on the Wednesday [8 July]. The defenders had mounted

¹⁰ Imād al-Dīn wrote that he always wanted to know the reasons for Saladin's vow and claimed, on the authority of al-Qādī al-Fāḍil via Emir ‘Abd al-Azīz, a member of the former ruling house of Ifrīqiya, that it was part of a vow of re-dedication to the Jihad made at the time of his illness in Harrān (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 291).

the city wall, displaying their intention to resist and hold out. Saladin and his men were amazed at that because they knew that their troops, both horse and foot, were either dead or captive and that only a few had survived. However, he made camp that day and on the Thursday mounted up with the aim of attacking and engaging the city. While he was considering at what point to launch his attack, many of the inhabitants emerged to submit and seek terms. They were granted and he guaranteed them their lives and their property, giving them the option of staying or departing. They chose to depart in fear of the Muslims and left in disorder, carrying whatever they could of their goods. The rest they abandoned.

The Muslims made their entry on Thursday 1 Jumādā I [9 July 1187] and they celebrated the Friday prayer in the mosque that had formerly been the Muslims'. The Franks made it a church but Saladin restored it as a mosque. This was the first Friday service celebrated on the Syrian littoral since the Frankish conquest. Saladin gave the city to his son al-Afdal. All the fief revenues, the villages and such like that had belonged to the Templars there he gave to the Lawyer 'Isā. What was left that the Franks could not manage to carry away the Muslims plundered. There was so much that it was impossible to count it. They found there a great deal of gold, jewels, siglaton, fine linen textiles,¹¹ sugar,¹² weapons and goods of other sorts, for the city was the destination for Frankish, Greek and other merchants from lands far and near. Much of all this had been put into store by the merchants who had departed because of the sluggish market and there was no-one to transport it. Saladin and his son al-Afdal distributed all this [540] to their followers but mostly this was done by al-Afdal because he remained in the city. His character for generosity was well-known. Saladin stayed in Acre a few days to set its affairs in order and establish its governance.

Account of the conquest of Majdal Yāba

After Saladin had defeated the Franks, he sent to his brother al-'Ādil in Egypt to announce this good news and to order him to march into Frankish territory from the direction of Egypt with the troops that remained with him and to besiege the nearest parts. He hastened to obey, marched from Egypt and descended upon Majdal Yāba, which he surrounded and plundered. His letter announcing this came to Saladin and brought great good tidings.

¹¹ *Bunduqī* (see Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles*, 113, note 9; 132, note 87 and references there cited).

¹² Correct the text's reading: *al-sh.k.r.* Note that Taqī al-Dīn seized the contents of 'the sugar factory' (*dār al-sukkār*) at Acre, see *Sanā al-barq*, 301; cf. *Rawdatayn*, iii, 311.

Account of the fall of several fortresses

During the period of his stay at Acre Saladin sent different detachments of his troops to Nazareth, Caesarea, Haifa, Şaffūriyya, Ma'layā, Shaqīf,¹³ Fūla and other towns in the vicinity of Acre. They took and plundered them, making their men prisoners and their women and children slaves. The number of them they brought filled the horizons. Saladin dispatched Taqī al-Dīn to camp before Tibnīn to prevent supplies getting to it and Tyre. He also sent Ḥusām al-Dīn [Muhammad ibn] 'Umar ibn Lājīn with a force towards Nablus. He came to Sebastea, where was the tomb of Zacharias, which he took from the hands of the local Christians and handed over to the Muslims. When he reached Nablus, he entered the town and put the citadel under siege, whose defenders he persuaded to surrender on terms. He took over the citadel but the town's inhabitants stayed in place and were confirmed in possession of their properties and belongings.¹⁴

[541] Account of the conquest of Jaffa

After al-'Ādil had left Egypt and taken Majdal Yāba, as we have mentioned, he proceeded to the town of Jaffa, which is on the coast, besieged it and, having taken it by force of arms, sacked it, captured the men and enslaved the women. Its inhabitants suffered what the inhabitants of no other town in those regions suffered.

When I was in Aleppo, I had a slave girl, one of the people of Jaffa, who had a child of about one year of age. He fell from her arms and grazed his face. She wept greatly for him. I calmed her and told her that there was nothing the matter with the boy to necessitate such weeping. She replied, 'Not for him am I weeping, but for what has befallen us. I had six brothers, all of whom have perished, and a husband and two sisters; what has happened to them I have no idea.' This is the case of a single woman; for the rest it would be proportionate.

In Aleppo I saw a Frankish woman who had come to a door with her master. He knocked at the door and the owner of the house came out and spoke with them. Then he brought out another Frankish woman. When the first one caught sight of this other, they both cried out and embraced one another, screaming and weeping. They fell to the ground and sat talking. It transpired that they were two sisters. They had a number of family members but knew nothing about any one of them.

¹³ It is not clear which place is intended. Shaqīf Arnūn (Beaufort) is hardly likely. Perhaps Shaqīf Tīrūn (Cavea de Tyrum), near Sidon and guarding the road to Damascus (Elisséeff, ii, 600) is meant. It is noteworthy that it is not mentioned in the list of conquests at this time found in *Fath*.

¹⁴ Imād al-Dīn comments that most of the inhabitants of Nablus and the villages around were Muslim (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 315).

Account of the conquest of Tibnīn, Sidon, Jubayl and Beirut

As for Tibnīn, we have mentioned that Saladin dispatched there Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew. On his arrival he put in place, and maintained, a siege. He saw that his siege would only be successful with the arrival of his uncle, [542] Saladin. He therefore sent to him to inform him of the situation and to urge him to come. On 8 Jumādā I [16 July] Saladin set out and came to him on the 11th of the month [19 July]. He put it under a close siege and carried out assaults, though it was a strong castle on a hill. When the defenders' situation became serious and the siege intensified, they released the Muslim captives they held, who numbered more than a hundred. When they came to the camp, Saladin gathered them together, provided them with clothes and money and sent them to their families. The Franks continued thus for five days but then sent seeking terms. Saladin guaranteed them their lives, so they surrendered the castle to him.¹⁵ He kept his word to them and sent them to a place of safety.

Now Sidon was Saladin's destination after he had dealt with Tibnīn. On his way he passed Ḫarafand,¹⁶ which he took easily without a fight before going on to Sidon, a well-known city on the coast. When its ruler heard of his approach, he departed and left it empty of anyone to resist and provide defence. When Saladin arrived, he took it over the very moment of his arrival. It was taken on 21 Jumādā I [29 July].¹⁷

Beirut is one of the strongest towns on the coast and one of the most pleasant and salubrious. After his taking Sidon, Saladin immediately set out towards Beirut and arrived there the next day. He saw that the inhabitants had manned the wall and made a show of force, firmness and preparedness. For several days they fought fiercely on the walls, led astray by the strength of the city and imagining that they were able to hold it. The Muslims made assaults time after time and while the Franks were resisting on the wall, suddenly they heard a loud uproar and a mighty commotion. Men came to them with the news that the Muslims had forced an entry from another direction. They sent to investigate the report and found no truth in it. They wished to calm those within but were unable to do so because of the great multitude that had gathered there. When they feared for their own lives because [543] of the dissension that had broken out, they sent asking for terms. Saladin guaranteed them their lives and their property and took over the town on 29 Jumādā I [6 August]. The siege had lasted eight days.

As for Jubayl, its lord was one of the captives that had been sent to Damascus with their king. He spoke with Saladin's deputy at Damascus about surrendering

¹⁵ Tibnīn (Toron) surrendered on Sunday 18 Jumādā I/26 July 1187 (*Fath*, 37; *Conquête*, 39).

¹⁶ The Frankish Sarepta on the coast between Tyre and Sidon. See Yāqūt, iii, 362.

¹⁷ Kāmil in error has '11 Jumādā I'. Cf. Bahā' al-Dīn, 76 (also quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iii, 322): Wednesday 21 Jumādā I. See also Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 269.

Jubayl on condition that he would be released. Saladin, when informed of this, summoned him in chains and under strict surveillance. The army was then at Beirut. When his fortress was handed over¹⁸ and the Muslim prisoners there set free, Saladin released him as he had undertaken to do. This lord of Jubayl was one of the leading Franks, a man of policy, cunning and evil, proverbially so amongst them. He was a devilish¹⁹ enemy of the Muslims and his release was a cause of weakness for the Muslims, as will become clear.²⁰

Account of the coming of the Marquis to Tyre

After his flight from Ḥaṭṭīn, the Count, lord of Tripoli, came to Tyre for a while. It is the most impregnable of the coastal cities and the strongest to resist attackers. When he saw that the sultan had taken Tibnīn, Sidon and Beirut, he feared that Saladin would attack Tyre, while it was devoid of men to fight, guard and protect it, and that he would not be strong enough to hold it. So he left and went to Tripoli. Tyre remained empty with no-one to defend and hold it against the Muslims. Had Saladin begun with it before Tibnīn and elsewhere, he would have taken it without difficulty, but he exaggerated its strength and wished to remove his worries about its neighbouring districts, so that it would then be easy to take it. This was the reason why it was held, for God's purpose is a foreordained fate.

It happened that a Frank from over the sea, called [544] the Marquis²¹ (God curse him) came by sea with much wealth to go on pilgrimage and to trade. Without being aware of what had happened to the Franks he anchored at Acre. He was suspicious when he saw that the customs of the Franks on the arrival of Frankish ships, the ringing of bells and such like, were neglected and also when he saw the garb of the people in the town. He stood off, not knowing what the news was and also as the wind had dropped. Al-Afdal sent one of his men out to him in a boat, to see who it was and what he wanted. This envoy came to the Marquis who asked him what the news was, when he had his doubts about him. He told him of the defeat of the Franks, that Acre and elsewhere had been taken and informed him that Tyre, Ascalon and some other places were held by the Franks. He told him of the situation just as it was. The Marquis was unable to leave because of the lack of wind, so he sent the envoy back to ask for terms, to allow him to enter the harbour with his goods and wealth. This was granted but he sent him back several times, on each occasion asking for something he had not demanded on the first occasion. He was doing this to wait for the breeze to blow to allow him to sail away. While he was prevaricating, the wind rose and he made sail for Tyre.

¹⁸ It was surrendered on Tuesday 27 Jumādā I/4 August 1187 (*Faṭḥ*, 41, *Conquête*, 43).

¹⁹ Literally 'blue-eyed'.

²⁰ Note again that according to 'Imād al-Dīn the majority of the inhabitants of Sidon, Beirut and Jubayl were Muslim (*Faṭḥ*, 42).

²¹ Conrad of Montferrat, uncle of King Baldwin V.

Al-Afdal sent the galleys in pursuit but they did not catch him. He came to Tyre where a large host of Franks had already assembled, as Saladin, whenever he conquered a city, such as Acre or Beirut among others, as we have mentioned, gave its population terms and they all made their way to Tyre, so that a large number gathered there, although they had no leader to unite them and no commander to lead them in battle. They were not military men and were intending to make contact with Saladin, ask for terms and surrender the city. While they were intent on this, the Marquis came to them. He changed their minds, stiffened their morale and guaranteed to hold the city for them and to spend the wealth he had with him. He stipulated that the city and its district should be his and no other's. They accepted this. He took their oaths on that and remained with them and organized their affairs. He was a devil among men, good at organizing and defending, a man of great bravery. He began to fortify the city, deepened its moats and repaired its walls, greatly increasing its strength. The men there agreed to hold on and fight for the city.

[545] Account of the conquest of Ascalon and neighbouring places

After Saladin had taken Beirut, Jubayl and other places, Ascalon and Jerusalem were his most important objectives for several reasons, including the fact that they were on the route to Egypt that linked the latter with Syria. He was eager that his dominions should be contiguous to facilitate the egress and ingress of troops and because the conquest of Jerusalem would bring excellent fame and great repute, among other such aims. He therefore marched from Beirut towards Ascalon. He joined forces with his brother al-'Ādil and the troops of Egypt he had with him and they descended upon Ascalon on Sunday 16 Jumādā II [23 August 1187]. Saladin had summoned the Frankish king and the master of the Templars from Damascus and he said to them, 'If you surrender the city to me, you can have safe-conduct', so they sent to the Franks in Ascalon, ordering them to surrender the city. However, they did not obey the order but gave them a very insolent reply and called them cowards in a hurtful way.

Seeing this, Saladin intensified his attack on the city, erected trebuchets and assaulted it time after time. The sappers advanced to the wall and did some damage to the barbican. All the while their king was repeating his messages that they should surrender, urging them and promising them that, when he was freed from captivity, he would ravage the Muslims' lands with fire, seek help from the Franks overseas and bring them cavalry and infantry from Frankish lands, both near and far, but they were not responding to his words nor listening to what he urged.

However, when they saw that they were daily becoming weaker and feebler, that when one of their number was killed they were unable to find a replacement and that there was no relief force they could expect, they made contact with their captive king to surrender the city on certain terms they stipulated. Saladin agreed

them. During the siege they had killed a great emir of the Mihrānī [Kurds]²² and they feared that when they left the city his clan would kill some of them [546] to revenge him, so they were very careful about the conditions they made for their own security. All of this was granted and they surrendered the city the last day of Jumādā II [5 September]. The siege had lasted fourteen days. Saladin sent them, their women and children and their property to Jerusalem and fulfilled the terms he had given them.

Account of the taking of the towns and fortresses near to Ascalon

After taking Ascalon Saladin remained outside and dispatched squadrons throughout the neighbouring country. They took Ramla, Dārūm, Gaza, the shrine of Ibrahim the Friend of God,²³ Yubnā, Bethlehem, Bayt Jibrīl, Latrun and all that had belonged to the Templars.²⁴

Account of the conquest of Jerusalem

When Saladin had finished with Ascalon and the neighbouring places, as has been mentioned, he sent to Egypt and ordered out its fleet with a complement of fighting men, commanded by Ḥusām al-Dīn Lu'lū' the Chamberlain, famous for his valour, boldness and good fortune. They remained at sea, interrupting the passage of the Franks. Any vessel of theirs they saw they seized and every galley they captured. When the fleet had arrived and Saladin's mind was eased on that front, he marched from Ascalon towards Jerusalem. The Patriarch, revered by the Franks and more important than their king, was there, as also was Balian, lord of Ramla, whose standing in their eyes was equal to that of the king. There too were their knights who had escaped [547] from Ḥaṭṭīn. They had gathered there in numbers. The inhabitants of those areas, such as Ascalon and elsewhere, had congregated there, a large host, all of whom considered death easier to bear than that the Muslims should conquer Jerusalem and take it away from them and thought that part of their duty to hold on to it was to offer their lives, their money and their children. During these days they fortified the city with whatever they could find for the purpose. They manned the walls, fully armed, united to defend and protect it with all their strength and ability and showing determination to fight for it to the utmost. They erected trebuchets on the walls to prevent attempts to draw close and press the city hard.

²² He was Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥusayn al-Mihrānī (*Fath*, 46).

²³ i.e. al-Khalīl or Hebron.

²⁴ Imād al-Dīn wrote: 'The sultan had taken on his way there [to Ascalon] Ramla, Yubnā, Bethlehem and Hebron. He remained there until the Templar fortresses surrendered, Latrūn and Bayt Jibrīl' (*Fath*, 46).

When Saladin approached, an emir²⁵ with a company of his men went forward incautiously and without care. He was met by a detachment of Franks who had left Jerusalem to act as scouts. They came into conflict and he and several of his men were slain. His death troubled the Muslims and they were stricken by his loss. However, they proceeded and camped before Jerusalem in the middle of Rajab [20 September 1187].

When they made camp, the Muslims saw on the walls enough men to dismay them and from the inhabitants within the city they heard such a clamour and shouting as indicated the great number of those gathered there. For five days Saladin continued to circle around the city to consider at what point to attack it, because it was extremely strong and well-defended. He found no place to attack from but on the north side around the Damascus Gate and the Church of Zion.²⁶ He moved to that side on 20 Rajab [25 September] and camped there. That night he erected trebuchets and by the morning they were set up and in operation. The Franks also erected trebuchets on the walls and threw missiles from them.

It was the fiercest fight that anyone had ever seen, as each of the two sides believed that it was a religious task and a binding duty. There was no need for any motivating by the leaders.²⁷ No, all were either resisting and not giving up, driving back and refusing to be driven back. The Frankish cavalry were daily making sallies to fight and challenge the enemy. [548] Men were killed on both sides. On the Muslim side the Emir 'Izz al-Dīn 'Isā ibn Mālik, one of the senior emirs, whose father had been the lord of Qal'at Ja'bār, met a martyr's death. He was personally engaging in combat every day and met his death and the mercy of God Almighty. He was loved by the elite and the commons alike. When the Muslims saw him brought down, this grieved them and affected their hearts. They charged as one man and drove the Franks from their positions and forced them back into the city. The Muslims reached the ditch, crossed it and gained the wall which they began to mine. The archers advanced to protect them, while the trebuchets kept up their bombardment to sweep the Franks from the walls to allow the sappers to mine. When they had finished they filled the mine with the usual materials.

The Franks saw how fiercely the Muslims fought, the overwhelming effect of the trebuchets with their unbroken bombardment, the sappers' success with their mining and they realized that their destruction was imminent, so their leaders

²⁵ Named in Ibn Wāṣil, ii, 212, as Jamāl al-Dīn Sharwīn ibn Ḥasan al-Zarzārī, a Kurdish officer.

²⁶ The text's *kanīsat Ṣahyūn* presumably refers to the church of Mt Zion but that is situated on the south side of the city. Perhaps at some stage this text replaced reference to the church of St Stephen which was outside Damascus Gate. Note that the MSS of Ibn Wāṣil, whose source was the *Kāmil*, did not mention 'the church of Zion', although the editor has inserted it (Ibn Wāṣil, ii, 212). 'Imād al-Dīn writes only of 'a move - to the north side'; see *Faṭḥ*, 52-3, *Conquête*, 45 ('du côté' should surely be 'au côté').

²⁷ This is an interpretation of *bā'ith sultānī* (official incentive), which in the context applies to both sides.

gathered to consult about what to do or not do. They agreed to ask for terms and to surrender Jerusalem to Saladin. They sent several of their great men and notables to ask for terms. When they spoke of this to the sultan, he refused their request and said, 'I will treat you only as you treated the inhabitants when you conquered it in the year 491,²⁸ by killing, enslaving and requiting evil with evil.' When the envoys returned disappointed and rejected, Balian²⁹ sent and asked for safe-conduct for himself to come before Saladin to discuss and arrange this matter. This was granted. He came before him and made his eager request for terms but without success. He pleaded with Saladin but he was not moved; he asked him to show mercy but he showed none.

When Balian despaired, he said to Saladin, 'O sultan, understand that in this city we are a great host that God alone can comprehend. They are tempering their fighting merely in the hope of terms, thinking that you will grant terms to them as you have to others. They shun death and desire life. However, if they see that death is inevitable, by God we will slay our sons and women, burn [549] our property and goods and not leave you to benefit from it by a single dinar or dirham, nor take captive a single man or woman. When we have finished that, we shall destroy the Dome of the Rock, the Aqsa Mosque and other sites and then kill the Muslim prisoners we have, 5,000 in number. We shall not leave for you any mount or animal without killing it. Then we shall come forth, all of us, against you and fight you like desperate men fighting for their lives. Not one of us will be killed at that time until he kills many more of you. We shall die nobly or win victory gloriously.'

Saladin consulted his men and they agreed to grant the Franks terms and that they should not be forced out and brought to embark on a course whose outcome would have unforeseen consequences. 'We should consider them captives in our hands and we should sell them their lives at a price fixed between them and us.' Thereupon Saladin agreed to offer terms to the Franks. It was settled that each man should pay ten dinars, the same for both rich and poor, each child, whether male or female, two dinars and a woman five dinars. All who paid this within forty days would be safe. Anyone who had not paid what was due before the expiration of the forty days would become a slave. Balian offered 30,000 dinars on behalf of the poor and this was accepted.

The city was surrendered on Friday 27 Rajab [2 October 1187], a day to be remembered. The banners of Islam were raised on the walls and Saladin stationed emirs at every gate of the city as clerks to take the fixed ransom from the inhabitants, but they employed deceit and did not fulfil their trust. The clerks divided up the money. Had it been dealt with trustworthy, it would have filled the treasure chests and been enough for everyone, for a reliable count made the population 60,000 men, mounted or foot soldiers, apart from the women and

²⁸ This is, of course, an error. Jerusalem fell to the Crusaders in 492/1099, as the author was well aware (*Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr* (1), 21).

²⁹ In the text Bāliyān ibn Bīrzān, i.e. Balian II of Ibelin and Ramla.

children who depended on them. One should not be astonished to hear that, because it is a large city and people had gathered there from these regions, Ascalon, for example, Dārūm, Ramla, [550] Gaza and other towns, so that the streets and churches were crowded and walking was difficult.

An indication of the great multitude is that, while most of them paid the agreed ransom, Balian secured freedom for 18,000 men, on behalf of whom he paid 30,000 dinars. After all this there remained those who had nothing to give and 16,000 souls, men, women and children, were made captive. This is securely documented.

Each one of a group of emirs claimed that several of the peasants of his fief were residing in Jerusalem and thus released them and himself received their ransom.³⁰ Several emirs dressed Franks in the fashion of Muslim soldiers and got them out, while taking from them the ransom payment they imposed. Yet others asked Saladin to give them a number of Franks. After he had given them, they took their ransom payment. All in all only a little amount reached his treasure chests.

There was in Jerusalem a Greek royal lady who had lived there as a nun, accompanied by a large retinue of attendants, slaves and slave girls and having with her a large amount of money and precious jewels. She asked for a safe-conduct for herself and those with her. Saladin granted this request and conveyed her away.

He also set free the queen of Jerusalem, whose husband, now a captive of Saladin, had become king of the Franks through her and ruled as her deputy. He also released her wealth and her retinue. She sought permission to go to her husband, at this time confined in the citadel at Nablus. Saladin gave her permission, so she went to him and remained there with him.

The wife of Prince Reynald, lord of Kerak, whom Saladin had killed with his own hand the day of the battle of Hattin, also came to him and interceded for a captive son of hers. Saladin said to her, 'If you surrender Kerak, I shall free him', so she went to Kerak but she was not listened to [551] by the Franks within. They did not surrender it, so he did not free her son. However, he released her possessions and those who attended her.³¹

The Patriarch of the Franks left with a large amount, which God alone could grasp, of the wealth of the churches, such as the [Dome of] the Rock, the Aqsa, the Holy Sepulchre and others. He himself had a comparable amount but Saladin did not trouble him. It was suggested to him that he should seize what he had to

³⁰ Two persons are named in this context. Mużaffar al-Dīn [Kūkbūrī] claimed about 1,000 Armenians, said to be from Edessa, and the lord of al-Bīra (unidentified) claimed about 500 as his subjects (*Fath*, 56).

³¹ Concerning these ladies, see *Fath*, 56 (cf. *Conquête*, 46, note 2): an unnamed Greek princess; Queen Sybilla, wife of King Guy and daughter of King Amalric I (see above under year 582); 'daughter of Philip, mother of Humphrey', i.e. Stephanie of Milly, whose first husband had been Humphrey III of Toron. It was their son, Humphrey IV, whose release she sought.

strength the Muslims' cause but he said, 'I will not act treacherously towards him', and all he took from him was ten dinars. He sent everyone away, accompanied by an escort to guard them as far as Tyre.

On top of the Dome of the Rock was a great gilded cross. When the Muslims entered the city on the Friday, several men climbed to the top of the dome to displace the cross. When they did so and it fell, everyone in the city and outside, both Muslims and Franks, cried out as one. The Muslims shouted 'God is great!' in joy, while the Franks cried out in distress and pain. People heard a clamour so great and loud that the earth well-nigh shook under them.

After the conquest and the departure of the infidels, Saladin ordered its buildings to be restored to their former state. The Templars had built dwellings west of the Aqsa Mosque and had erected there all that they needed, storerooms, a privy and such like. They had incorporated part of the Aqsa in their buildings, so it was now returned to its original state. Saladin ordered the mosque and the Dome of the Rock to be cleansed of filth and impurities. All this was duly done.

On the following Friday, 4 Sha'bān [9 October 1187], the Muslims and Saladin with them prayed the Friday prayer there. He performed the prayer in the Dome of the Rock. The preacher and the imam was Muhyī al-Dīn ibn al-Zakī, the cadi of Damascus. Later Saladin appointed a preacher and an imam for the five [daily] prayers and he ordered that a pulpit should be made. He was told that Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd had already made a pulpit in Aleppo, for the beautification and perfection of which he had commanded the craftsmen to spare no pains, adding, 'This [552] we have had made to be erected in Jerusalem.' The carpenters finished it over several years. There had never been another like it in Islam. So Saladin ordered that it be brought, so it was transported from Aleppo and erected in Jerusalem. Between its manufacture and its transportation more than twenty years passed. This was one of Nūr al-Dīn's inspired acts and an example of the excellence of his aims (God have mercy on him).³²

When Saladin had completed the Friday prayer, he commanded the repair of the Aqsa Mosque and the use of all means to beautify and adorn it and to restore its inscriptions accurately. He brought the incomparable marble, gilded mosaics from Constantinople and other necessary things, which had been stored over long years. Restoration was begun and the images in those buildings were effaced. The Franks had laid a marble pavement above the Rock and covered it over. This he ordered to be uncovered. The reason why it had been paved over was that the priests sold much of it to the Franks who came to them from overseas on pilgrimage. They would buy it for its weight in gold, hoping to benefit from its sanctity. When one of them returned to his homeland with a little piece of it he would build a church for it and place it on its altar. One of their kings feared that it would be all lost, so he ordered it to be paved over to preserve it. After the Rock was uncovered, Saladin transferred there handsome Koran copies and fine reading stands. He also

³² For Nūr al-Dīn's pulpit (*minbar*), see *Rawdatayn*, iii, 392–6. An arsonist burnt it in 1969.

established Koran reciters and provided large stipends for them. Islam was restored there fresh and new. This blessed deed, the conquering of Jerusalem, is something achieved by none but Saladin (God have mercy on him) since the time of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb³³ (God be pleased with him). This is his sufficient glory and honour.

Its Frankish population remained and embarked on the sale of their chattels, stores and valuables they could not transport and whatever they were incapable of carrying. This they sold at very cheap prices. The merchants, followers of the Muslim army, bought it, as did the local Christians of Jerusalem who were not Franks. The latter requested Saladin to allow them to remain in [553] their dwellings and to pay the tribute.³⁴ He granted their request. At that time they bought some of the property of the Franks, who also abandoned many things they could not sell, such as beds, chests, barrels and such like. They also left a great deal of marble, the like of which is not to be found, columns and slabs, and mosaics and other things. And so they departed.

Account of Saladin's move to Tyre to invest it

After Saladin had conquered Jerusalem, he remained outside until 25 Sha‘bān [30 October 1187], arranging the affairs and state of the city. He ordered the establishment of hospices and madrasahs. The residence of the Hospitallers he converted into a madrasah for the Shāfi‘īs, which was of the greatest possible beauty.³⁵ When he had finished ordering the city, he set out for Tyre, where a great host of Franks had congregated. The Marquis had become its ruler and the authority there. He led the Franks very well and did his utmost to strengthen the city. Saladin reached Acre and remained there a few days. When the Marquis heard of his arrival there, he redoubled his work on Tyre's wall and the ditch, which he deepened and made continuous from the sea to the sea on the other side. The city became like an island in the midst of the sea, impossible to reach or approach.

Saladin then left Acre and arrived before Tyre on 9 Ramaḍān [12 November]. He camped at a river near the city where he could watch it, until his men gathered and joined him. He moved on 22 Ramaḍān [25 November] and camped by a hill close to the city wall, where he could observe the battle. He allotted the assault

³³ The second caliph of Islam (634-44 AD), successor of Abū Bakr.

³⁴ In Arabic *al-jizya*, i.e. the poll-tax imposed on non-Muslims, Christians and Jews, in return for protected status and cult freedom.

³⁵ Ibn al-Athīr is probably incorrect here. No other text mentions the conversion of the Hospitallers' residence into a madrasah. There was perhaps a confusion with their residence in Acre which Saladin made a waqf, half for lawyers and half for Sufis (*Rawdatayn*, iii, 415). The most important conversion in Jerusalem was that of the church of St Anne into a Shāfi‘ī madrasah. For Saladin's works at Jerusalem, see *Conquête*, 58-9 and Richards, 'Saladin's Hospital'.

amongst the army, to each detachment a fixed period in which they would fight, [554] so that the defenders would be kept continuously engaged. However, the place where they fought was a short stretch, which a small company of the garrison was enough to defend, protected as it was by ditches that reached from sea to sea. Birds could hardly fly over them. The city was like a hand in the sea with its forearm connected with the mainland and the sea on both sides of it. Fighting was only possible on the forearm. More than once the Muslims attacked with trebuchets, catapults, crossbows and siege towers. Saladin's family took their turn in the fighting, such as his son al-Afdal, his son al-Zāhir Ghāzī, his brother al-Ādil and his nephew Taqī al-Dīn and likewise all the other emirs.

The Franks had galleys and *harrāqas* (caraccas) in which they put to sea and stationed themselves on both sides of the area from which the Muslims were engaging the garrison and shot at the Muslim flanks with crossbows. This attack was grievous to them because the garrison engaged them from ahead and the men in the galleys from the sides. Their arrows passed from one side to the other because of the narrowness of the position and many of the Muslims were wounded or killed. They were unable to get close to the city. Saladin therefore sent for the galleys, ten vessels in all, which had come from Egypt and were at Acre. He summoned them with their crews, fighting men and weaponry. They were then at sea preventing the galleys of the men of Tyre from putting out to engage the Muslims. The latter were then able to approach the city and attack it. They did so both by land and by sea and pressed the defenders hard, so that they were almost victorious. Then fate brought about what no-one had counted on. Five of the Muslim galleys spent one of those nights at anchor opposite the harbour of Tyre to prevent entry or egress. They passed the night watchfully. Their commander was ‘Abd al-Salām the Maghribī, known for his skill at seamanship and for his bravery. When dawn came, they felt secure and took some sleep. The next thing they knew the Frankish galleys had come upon them, [555] surrounded them closely and overwhelmed them. The Franks killed those they wished to kill and seized the rest with their ships and took them into the harbour of Tyre, in view of the Muslims on land. Several of the Muslim [seamen] threw themselves overboard from the galleys. Some swam to safety but others drowned.

Saladin ordered the remaining galleys to sail to Beirut as they were no longer useful because they were so few. They made sail but were pursued by the Frankish galleys. When those on board the Muslim ships saw the Franks in hot pursuit of them, they cast themselves ashore in their galleys, saved themselves and abandoned their ships. Saladin secured them and broke them up.³⁶ He then returned to the assault of Tyre from landward but that was of little use because of the narrow approach.

One day the Franks came forth and fought the Muslims beyond their ditches. The conflict between the two sides was fierce and lasted until the end of the day.

³⁶ For this naval reverse, cf. *Conquête*, 70–71.

They had moved out before the late afternoon prayer. A great and celebrated knight was taken captive after there had been on both sides much fighting and killing around him after he had fallen. When he was taken he was put to death.³⁷ This state of affairs continued for a number of days.

Account of Saladin's departure from Tyre to Acre and the dispersal of the troops

When Saladin saw that the Tyre operation would be a long one, he departed. This was his practice. Whenever a city held firm against him he tired of it and its siege and therefore left it. During this year he did not stay long at any city but conquered all in a few days, as we have mentioned, without fatigue or hardship. When he and his men saw how difficult a proposition Tyre was, they became impatient with it and asked to leave. No-one was to blame for this but Saladin, for he was the person who sent the Frankish troops there and supplied it with manpower and resources from the populations of Acre, Ascalon, Jerusalem and elsewhere, as we have previously told. He gave them safe-conducts and sent them to Tyre [556] and thus the surviving Frankish knights on the coast came to be there with their money and the money of the merchants and others. They held the city and wrote to the Franks beyond the sea, asking for their aid. They replied to them with a ready response to their appeal and a promise of assistance. They bade them hold Tyre so that it could be a rallying point and base³⁸ where they could be safe and find refuge. This increased their eagerness to hold and defend the place.

God willing, we shall mention what the sequel of these events was to make it known that a ruler ought not to give up resoluteness, even if fates are aiding him. That he should fail while being resolute is better than that he should succeed while being remiss and losing his resolve and is more likely to justify him in the eyes of men.

When Saladin had it in mind to depart, he consulted his emirs who were not of one mind. Some said, 'The best plan is to leave. Men have been wounded and killed. They are weary and their pay is exhausted. The winter has arrived and the field of battle is under mud. Let us rest and recover during this cold. When the spring comes, we will gather and return here and to other places.' This was what the rich among them said, as though they feared that the sultan, if he remained, would borrow from them to spend on the army because his campaign chests and the treasures were devoid of dirhams and dinars, for he was spending all that was

³⁷ It was initially thought that the Marquis Conrad of Montferrat had been killed (*Conquête*, 73).

³⁸ In Arabic *dār hijratihim*, i.e. 'abode of their emigration'. Originally, *dār al-hijra* referred to Medina to which the Prophet Muhammad moved from Mecca in 622 AD. The phrase developed symbolic meanings. Present are notions of 'refuge' and of 'centre for future activity'.

brought to him. Another group said, ‘The right plan is to persevere against the city and press it hard. It is their fortress on which they depend. When we take it from them, all the hopes of those beyond the sea for this place will come to nothing and we shall take the rest of the territory with great ease.’

Saladin continued to hesitate between departing and staying. When those who thought it right to depart saw that he still remained, they neglected their share of the fighting and the operation of the trebuchets. They made the excuse that their men were wounded or that they had sent some of them to fetch supplies of cash, fodder for their animals and provisions for themselves and other such excuses. So they ended up present but not fighting. Forced to withdraw, Saladin left for Acre at the end of Shawwāl, that is the beginning of Kānūn II [1 January 1188]³⁹ [557]. He gave leave to all the armies to return to their homelands, to rest during the winter and return in the spring. The armies of the East, Mosul and others departed, as did those of Syria and those of Egypt. His special guard⁴⁰ remained resident in Acre. He resided in the citadel there and entrusted the affairs of the city to ‘Izz al-Dīn Jūrdīk, one of Nūr al-Dīn’s senior mamlukes, who united true religion and bravery with good government.

Account of the conquest of Hūnīn

When Saladin had taken Tibnīn, the garrison of Hūnīn had refused to surrender it, one of the strongest and most impregnable of fortresses. He decided not to turn aside to deal with it and not to be himself distracted by a siege but rather he sent a detachment of troops and emirs who besieged it and prevented any supplies being taken there. He was then occupied, as we have described, with the conquest of Ascalon, Jerusalem and the rest. While he was besieging Tyre, the garrison of Hūnīn sent requesting terms. On these being granted, they surrendered and came down from the fortress. The terms granted them were honoured.

Account of the siege of Safed, Kawkab and Kerak

When Saladin had marched to Ascalon, he left men at the castle of Kawkab,⁴¹ which looks down on the Jordan, to besiege it and to guard the route for those who passed along it, to prevent the Franks within from coming down and cutting it. He sent another detachment of the army to the castle of Safed⁴² which they put under siege. [558] It looks down on the town of Tiberias.

³⁹ Kānūn I (December) is *Kāmil*'s reading. Correct on basis of *Fath*, 90 (*Conquête*, 80).

⁴⁰ i.e. his *halqa*, literally ‘ring, circle’. For this elite body, see Gibb, ‘Armies of Saladin’.

⁴¹ Known to the Franks as Belvoir (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 58–60).

⁴² See Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 128–9 and 190–98.

The castle of Kawkab belonged to the Hospitallers and Safed to the Templars. Both were close to Ḥaṭṭīn, the site of the battle. They provided refuge to some Templars and Hospitallers who survived and who held out there. When the Muslims besieged them both, people gained some relief from the wickedness of their inmates and routes were opened again, so that a single person could travel on them and not be in fear.

The commander of the men besieging Kawkab was an emir, called Sayf al-Dīn, the brother of Jāwulī al-Asadī, a bold and brave man with a respect for religion and piety. He remained at his post until the end of Shawwāl [=1 January 1188]. His men were keeping watch in fixed shifts. On the last night of Shawwāl the man whose shift it was neglected to keep watch. He performed his prayers and repeated them through the night until dawn. The night was one of much thunder and lightning, wind and rain. Before the Muslims who were at their rest knew what was happening, the Franks were among them with their swords. They put their weapons to work upon them and slew them all. The food, weapons and such like that the Muslims had they seized and returned to their castle. This strengthened them so much that they were enabled to hold the castle until it was taken towards the end of the year 584 [early 1189], as we shall relate. God willing.

The news of this came to Saladin as he was departing from Tyre and upset him greatly in addition to his grief at the loss of his galleys and their complement and his withdrawal from Tyre. He stationed at the fortress of Kawkab the Emir Qāymāz al-Najmī with another company of troops who continued its siege.

[559] Account of discord at Arafāt and the killing of Ibn al-Muqaddam

This year on ‘Arafat day [9 February 1188] Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, known as Ibn al-Muqaddam, was killed at ‘Arafāt. He was one of the senior emirs of Saladin, whose fame has already been sufficiently mentioned.

His death came about as follows. After the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem he asked Saladin for permission to go on Pilgrimage, to adopt pilgrim garb at Jerusalem and in the one year link all the following, the Jihad, Pilgrimage, a visit to [the shrine] of the Friend of God⁴³ (upon him be peace) and to the shrines of the prophets in Syria and a visit to the tomb of the Prophet of God (God bless him and give him peace). Permission was granted to him. This year a great multitude of pilgrims had gathered in Syria from different lands, Iraq, Mosul, Diyār Bakr, the Jazira, Khilāt, Anatolia, Egypt and others, to unite pilgrim visits to both Jerusalem and Mecca. Saladin appointed Ibn al-Muqaddam as their emir. They arrived safe and sound at ‘Arafāt, made the ritual ‘standing’⁴⁴ at that cult site and performed the normative rites.

⁴³ In Arabic al-Khalīl, namely Abraham, whose tomb is at Hebron.

⁴⁴ See *EI*(2), xi, 220–21, s.v. *wukūf*.

On the evening of ‘Arafat day he and his men made ready to go to ‘Arafāt. He ordered the drums to be beaten, the sign for departure, and his men duly beat them. The emir of the Iraqi pilgrims, Muṣṭafā al-Dīn Tāshṭakīn, then sent to him, ordering him not to depart from ‘Arafāt before him and to stop his men beating his drums. He replied, ‘I have no connection with you. You are the emir of the Iraqi pilgrimage and I the emir of the Syrian. Each of us may do what he decides and chooses.’ He then set out without delay, not listening to his words. When Tāshṭakīn saw his determination to disobey him, he rode out with his officers and troops, followed by a vast crowd and large assemblage of the riff-raff, idlers and trouble-makers of the Iraqi pilgrim body. They sought out [560] the Syrian pilgrims to intimidate them. When they became close to them, the matter got out of control and they were unable to repair the situation. The Iraqi trouble-makers violently attacked the Syrian pilgrims, killed several, plundered their property and seized some of their women, although they were later returned to them. Ibn al-Muqaddam received several wounds. He restrained his followers from violence. Had he allowed them, he would have given them justice and more so. However, he was mindful of God and the sanctity of the place and the day. After he had been weakened by his wounds, Tāshṭakīn took him to his tent and lodged him there to tend him and make good the shortfall in the consideration due to him. That night they left ‘Arafāt and the next day he died at Minā and was buried in the Ma'lā cemetery. Thus martyrdom was bestowed upon him after his efforts in the Jihad and his participation in the conquest of Jerusalem (may God have mercy on him).

Account of Sultan Tughril's becoming strong at the expense of Qizil

This year Sultan Tughril became powerful and his following numerous and he took control of much territory. Qizil sent to the caliph, asking for his support and warning him of Tughril. He offered his own allegiance and to act according to what was wanted. Meanwhile, Tughril sent an envoy to Baghdad, saying, ‘I wish the Diwan to command the restoration of the sultan’s palace so that I may reside there when I come.’ Qizil’s envoy was received with honour and promised support but Sultan Tughril’s envoy was sent back without a reply. The caliph ordered the demolition of the sultan’s palace. It was razed to the ground and all trace of it effaced.

[561] Account of the taking of Sarsutī and elsewhere in India and the subsequent defeat of the Muslims

At the end of this year [end of 1187] Shihāb al-Dīn⁴⁵ al-Ghūrī, the ruler of Ghazna,

⁴⁵ Muḥammad ibn Sām had taken the title Mu'izz al-Dīn and is more commonly known by that.

marched to India, attacked the land of Ajmer and gained knowledge of the region of al-Siwālik,⁴⁶ whose king was called Kūla, a brave and bold man. When the Muslims entered his lands, they took the city of Tabarinda, a strong and flourishing fortress. They also took Sarsutī and Kūwat Rām.⁴⁷

When their ruler heard of the great gathering of the Muslims, he marched towards them. Battle was joined and raged fiercely. The Hindus had fourteen elephants. When the fighting became intense, the right and left wings of the Muslims gave way. One of his close associates said to Shihāb al-Dīn, 'The left and right wings have been broken. Save yourself, the Muslims will not be destroyed.' But Shihāb al-Dīn took his spear and charged the Hindus. He came to the elephants and pierced one of them in the shoulder and an elephant's wound does not heal. When Shihāb al-Dīn came to the elephants, one of the Hindus threw a spear at him. It hit him on the forearm and passed right through to the other side. At that he fell to the ground and men fought around him to save him. The Hindus were eager to capture him. The fighting over him was like nothing ever heard of. His men took him up, put him on his horse and retired with him in defeat. The Hindus did not pursue them. When they had gone about a league from the battlefield, Shihāb al-Dīn fainted because of his great loss of blood. His men carried him for twenty-four leagues in a litter on their backs.⁴⁸ On his arrival at Lahore he seized the Ghurid emirs, who had fled and not held firm, and suspended on each one of them [562] some barley fodder and said, 'You are horses, you are not emirs!' He then went to Ghazna and ordered some of them to make their way there on foot. When he arrived at Ghazna, he remained there to allow his men rest. We shall recount later what he did to the Hindu ruler whom he defeated in the year 588 [1192-93], God willing.⁴⁹

Miscellaneous events

In Rabī' I of this year [11 May-9 June 1187] Majd al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl ibn al-Ṣāḥib, the major-domo of the caliph, was killed. His killing was ordered by the caliph, as he was the dominant figure in the administration. The caliph had no authority

⁴⁶ The region between Hānsi and Nāgawr, including the northern part of the Aravalli range (Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*, 130).

⁴⁷ According to *EI*(2), vii, 409, this campaign was in the winter of 586-7/1190-91 against the Čawhan kingdom of Delhi. Having captured Bhātinda (*sic*), Mu'izz al-Dīn was defeated (and wounded) by Prithvī Rāja at Tarāwṛī [Taraori] near Karnal. He revenged this defeat the following year at the same place. Sarsutī (in the text it begins with an 'sh') is a river and a town (modern Sirsa), eighty miles north-west of Delhi (*Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, i, 459, note 7; 468, note 3). Kuwāt Rām or Kuhrām is modern Ghuram in Patiala.

⁴⁸ These events are described by the 13th-century Persian historian Jūzjānī and amply annotated by the translator, Major Raverty (*Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, i, 457-64).

⁴⁹ For a discussion of the Ghurid conquests, see Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*, 7-19.

alongside him who was the person who had secured his recognition as caliph. He was found to have much wealth, which was all seized. He had been a good administrator, not greedy for others' property. The man who spread rumours about him was one of his associates, one of his own creatures, called 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus. He denounced him to the caliph and disparaged his achievements, so he was arrested and put to death.

In Rabī‘ II [10 June–8 July 1187] there was a fire in the storeyards at Baghdad and much timber was burnt. The reason was that a lawyer in the Nizāmiyya Madrasah was cooking some food for his meal. He forgot about the fire and the food being prepared. The fire caught hold and spread to the storeyards, which were all consumed in the blaze. The Chain Alley and others in the vicinity also caught fire.

In Shawwāl of this year [December 1187] the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh appointed Abū'l-Muẓaffar 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus as vizier and gave him the title Jalāl al-Dīn. The magnates of state paraded in his retinue, even the Chief Cadi, one of whose notaries had been this Ibn Yūnus. As he paraded in his retinue, he was saying, 'God curse a long life'.

The following died this year:

'Abd al-Mughīth ibn Zuhayr al-Ḥarrī at Baghdad in Muḥarram [13 March–11 April 1187]. He was one of the leading Ḥanbalīs, who studied much ḥadīth and composed a work on the virtues of Yazīd [563] ibn Mu'āwiya,⁵⁰ in which he wrote some surprising things. Abū'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī wrote a refutation of it. There was enmity between the two of them.

The Chief Cadi Abū'l-Ḥasan ibn al-Dāmghānī. He succeeded to the office of chief cadi for al-Muqtafī after the death of al-Zaynī. He then served al-Mustanjid bi-Allāh, but was dismissed until he was reinstated for al-Mustaqī' bi-Amr Allāh.

The Vizier Jalāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī⁵¹ ibn Jamāl al-Dīn Abī Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Abī Manṣūr, the vizier of the ruler of Mosul, otherwise known as al-Jawād ibn al-Jawād. We have already recorded sufficient of his history and that of his father to allow their high status to be understood. His body was carried to Medina, the city of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), where he was buried near his father.

'Alī⁵² ibn Khaṭṭāb ibn Zafar, the pious shaykh from Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar. He was one of 'the friends of God', one of those who perform saintly deeds. I associated with him for a while and never have I seen his like for excellence of character and behaviour, generosity and piety (God have mercy on him).

⁵⁰ The Umayyad caliph Yazīd (ruled 680–83 AD) became an unexpected 'hero' of extreme Ḥanbalīs, primarily because of his strong anti-Shiism.

⁵¹ Under the year 573 (see above p. [448]) 'Alī's death in 574 is mentioned, although Kāmil (Thornberg), xi, 297, gives 575. *Wāfi*, xxii, 99, gives the year 554!

⁵² Kāmil's text has no new paragraph here and the words 'In it [this year] there died' are missing before the name. The translation follows Kāmil (Thornberg), xi, 373.

Naṣr ibn Fityān ibn Maṭar, Abū'l-Fatḥ Ibn al-Mannī, the Ḥanbalī lawyer, who was without parallel (God have mercy on him).⁵³

This year a woman from the hinterland of Baghdad gave birth to a daughter who had teeth.⁵⁴

⁵³ He was born in 501/1107-8 and died on 5 Ramadān/8 November 1187 according to Ibn al-Qādisī (quoted in *Rawḍatayn*, iii, 426-7).

⁵⁴ This item in an original comes immediately before the notice of the death of Naṣr ibn Fityān.

Account of Saladin's siege of Kawkab

This year in Muḥarram [March 1188] winter's grip loosened, so Saladin, with the troops, who had stayed behind with him, marched from Acre to the castle of Kawkab and put it under siege. He made camp around it, thinking that it would be easily gained and that to take it, although he led few troops, would be feasible. When he saw it high and impregnable, he realized that to get to it was impossible. This place along with Safed and Kerak gave him much anxiety and worry, because the coastal lands from Acre southwards had all been conquered, but not these fortresses. He preferred that no place should be left in the middle of this region to trouble his mind, divide his efforts and require watching and also that the peasants and travellers passing through should not suffer great hardship from them.

After he had begun the siege and saw how strong it was so that it would be a slow matter to overcome and take it, he withdrew [6] and left in charge of the siege operations Qāymāz al-Najmī. He left during Rabī' I [30 April-29 May 1188]. Envoys of Prince Qilij Arslān, Qizil Arslān and others came to him with congratulations on his victorious conquests. From Kawkab he went to Damascus, whose people rejoiced at his coming. He wrote to all the lands ordering the armies to gather and remained there until his move to the coast.

How Saladin marched into Frankish territory

When Saladin expressed his intention of leaving Damascus, he visited al-Qādī al-Fāḍil, who was ill, to bid him farewell and to consult him. He took his leave of him and set out from Damascus to go to Homs in the middle of Rabī' I [14 May 1188]. He camped at the lake of Qadas, west of Homs, where the armies came to him. The first of the outlying princes to come was 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī ibn Mawdūd [ibn Zankī] ibn Āqsunqur, lord of Sinjār, Nisibis and Khābūr. The armies of Mosul and the regions of the Jazīra followed in succession and gathered around him in great numbers. He then moved to a position below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād on its eastern side. I was with him at that time.

He remained for two days and then left with a light force, leaving the army's baggage train where it was below the castle. He entered Frankish territory and raided Ṣāfīthā, 'Urayma, Yahmūr¹ and others lands and lordships. He came near to Tripoli, viewed the city and learnt from where to attack it and the route to

¹ Known to the Franks as Chastel Rouge (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 72-75).

withdraw. Then he returned safely to his camp. His troops had plundered an untold number of animals of various kinds. He remained below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād until the end of Rabī‘ II [27 June 1188].

[7] Account of the conquest of Jabala

When Saladin remained below Ḥiṣn al-Akrād, the cadi of Jabala, namely Manṣūr ibn Nabil, came to him, inviting him to come so that he could surrender the city to him. This cadi had been influential and trusted in his dealings with Bohemond, the ruler of Antioch and Jabala. He enjoyed much respect and high status, wielding authority over all the Muslims in Jabala and its districts in whatever concerned Bohemond. Zeal for the faith now persuaded him to seek out the sultan and he guaranteed him the conquest of Jabala, Lattakia and the northern towns. Saladin set out with him on 4 Jumādā I [1 July 1188] and stopped at Antartus on the 6th [3 July]. He saw that the Franks had abandoned the city and taken refuge in two strong towers, each one of them a strong citadel and an impregnable fortress. The Muslims proceeded to destroy their palaces, houses and the city wall and they plundered all the stores they found.

The Templars were in one of the towers which Saladin besieged. The men in the other tower surrendered to him on terms and gave it up. After giving them terms, Saladin razed the tower and threw the masonry into the sea. The Templars continued to hold out in the other. With them was their master whom Saladin had captured in the great battle and later released when he took Jerusalem. He was the one who held this strong point.

Saladin laid waste to the lordship of Antartus and then moved away to Maraqqiya,² which had been left deserted by its inhabitants who went to Marqab,³ one of their impregnable fortresses, which nobody can have any hope of conquering because of its height and strength. It was held by the Hospitallers and the main road passes below it. The fortress is on the right of the traveller to Jabala, while the sea is on his left. The passage is narrow, only allowing people to pass one after the other. It chanced that the Frankish ruler of Sicily had sent reinforcements for the Franks on the coast in sixty galleys. They were at Tripoli and when they heard of Saladin's march, they came and anchored at sea below Marqab in their galleys to stop anyone passing [8] by their archery. Seeing this, Saladin ordered mantlets and palisades which were ranged along the route on the seaward side from the beginning of the narrow passage till the end. Thus the Muslims passed through, every last man. They negotiated the pass, reached Jabala on 18 Jumādā I [15 July 1188] and received its surrender the moment they arrived.

The local cadi had arrived previously and entered the town. On Saladin's

² A coastal town opposite the island of Arwād.

³ Otherwise Margat, on the coast south of Jabala and Lattakia (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 163-79).

arrival he raised the banners on the walls and surrendered the town to him. The Franks there fortified themselves in the citadel. The cadi of Jabala kept up threats and promises until he persuaded them to give up on condition that they be given safe-conduct and that he would take hostages from them who would stay with him until the Franks released their hostages, some people from Jabala. Bohemond, the lord, had taken hostages from the cadi and the Muslims of Jabala and kept them with him at Antioch. The cadi took the Franks' hostages and lodged them with him until Bohemond released the Muslim hostages. Then the Muslims freed the Frankish hostages. The headman among the population of the Mountain came to Saladin to offer the people's allegiance. It is one of the most defensible mountains and very difficult of access. There is a castle there called Bikisrā'il between Jabala and the city of Hama. At this time the route from Muslim territory to join the army passed alongside and men were having difficulty in travelling it. Saladin organized the affairs of Jabala, appointed Emir Sābiq al-Dīn 'Uthmān ibn al-Dāya, lord of Shayzar, to hold it and then departed.

[9] Account of the taking of Lattakia

Having finished with affairs at Jabala, the sultan left for Lattakia, where he arrived on 24 Jumādā I [21 July 1188]. The Franks abandoned the city because they were unable to defend it. They went up into two fortresses it had on the mountain and held out there. The Muslims entered the city and besieged the two castles where the Franks were and carried out assaults. They mined a sixty cubit length of the wall and prepared it for firing. The fighting was fierce and became intensely so as they approached the wall. After the Franks became convinced of [imminent] disaster and the cadi of Jabala had entered and warned them of what the Muslims could do to them, they requested terms. Saladin granted them terms and the banners of Islam were raised on the two castles. This was on the third day of the siege.

Lattakia was constructed with the most beautiful buildings, very decorated and with plentiful marble of various sorts. The Muslims destroyed many of them and carried away the marble. They ravaged many of the churches there, on each of which vast sums of money had been spent. Saladin handed the city over to his nephew Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar, who developed it and fortified its citadel, so that if anyone had seen it previously he would not recognize it nor believe that it was indeed the same place. Taqī al-Dīn had high aspirations to fortify citadels and spend heavily on them, as he did with the citadel of Hama.

Account of what the Sicilian fleet did

When Saladin invested Lattakia, the Sicilian fleet, which we have mentioned before, came and anchored opposite the harbour of Lattakia. After the Franks who

were there had surrendered the town to Saladin, [10] the members of this fleet resolved to seize any of the inhabitants who left, out of anger and exasperation in that they had surrendered it quickly. The people of Lattakia heard of this, so remained and offered to pay jizya. This was the reason why they stayed.

The commander of the fleet requested safe-conduct from the sultan for a meeting with him. This was granted, so he attended and kissed the ground before him. He said the following in effect; ‘You are a merciful and noble sultan. You have done what you have done to the Franks and they have been humiliated. Leave them now to be your mamlukes and your soldiers through whom you will conquer lands and kingdoms. Restore their lands to them, otherwise there will come to you from beyond the sea what you will not have the power to stand against. The situation will be difficult for you and your position critical.’ The sultan answered him in a similar vein, expressing strength and belittling all who might come from over the seas and claiming that, if they came forth, he would make them taste death and captivity as he had their fellows. The commander crossed himself and returned to his men.

Account of the conquest of Şahyūn and several fortresses

Saladin left Lattakia on 27 Jumādā I [24 July 1188] and made for the castle of Şahyūn, which is a strong castle, towering high in the air and difficult to ascend to, situated on the spur of a hill and encompassed by a deep valley which at one point is narrow, so that from there a stone from a trebuchet may reach the fortress. However, on the north side the hill is joined to the castle and there they have constructed a deep ditch, the bottom of which is out of sight, and five strong walls. Saladin made camp on this hill which is alongside the castle and there set up trebuchets and bombarded it. On his orders his son, al-Zāhir, the lord of Aleppo, positioned himself at the narrow point of the valley and set up trebuchets there too and bombarded the fortress.⁴

[11] He had with him many infantry from Aleppo, who are famously well-regarded for their bravery. Their discharge of arrows from hand bows, crossbows, *zanbūraks* and *ziyārs*⁵ was continuous. Most of those in the fortress were wounded, while continuing to show fortitude and resistance. The Muslims made an assault on 2 Jumādā II [29 July 1188]. They clung to a corner of that hill which the Franks

⁴ For an account of Şahyūn (otherwise Saone or Saladin's Castle), see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 84-96. Cf. Saadé, ‘Château de Saladin’, 987-96 (for period of Frankish occupation), 996-1003 (for discussion of Saladin's siege).

⁵ ‘Crossbow’ translates *jarkh*, which was the stirrup crossbow. The *zanbūrak* (little wasp) probably had a ratchet mechanism and discharged a heavy bolt, while the *ziyār* was ‘no longer a portable arbalest but a siege engine mounted on a fixed chassis’ (*EI*(2), iv, 798) and probably delivering multiple missiles. For *ziyār*, see also Cahen, ‘Un traité’, 129-30; 151-2.

had neglected to secure and from there climbed up between the rocks until they gained the outer wall. They engaged the men on it and seized it. They fought the Franks on the remaining walls and gained three of them, seizing the cattle, horses, stores and other things there. The Franks sought refuge in the castle keep, where the Muslims attacked them. They cried out and asked for safe-conduct. Saladin did not grant it to them but imposed on their persons the same ransom as at Jerusalem. He took over the fortress and handed it to an emir called Nāṣir al-Dīn Mankūbars, lord of the castle of Abū Qubays, who fortified it and made it one of the most impregnable of castles.

After the Muslims had taken Şahyūn, they dispersed about those regions and took the fort of Balāṭunūs. The Franks who were there had already fled and abandoned it in fear and panic. Saladin also took the fort of ‘Aydhū⁶ and that of Jamāhiriyā.⁷ The dominion of Islam became extensive in that region, although the easy route there was not passable because part of it was in the hands of the Ismā‘ilīs and part in Frankish hands.

[12] Account of the conquest of the fortress of Bakās and al-Shughr

Saladin left Şahyūn on 3 Jumādā II [30 July] and arrived at the castle of Bakās. He saw that the Franks had evacuated it and fortified themselves in the castle of al-Shughr. He therefore took Bakās without a fight and proceeded to al-Shughr which he put under siege. It and Bakās are on the easy route which is taken to get to Lattakia and Jabala and the lands of Islamic Syria which Saladin had conquered. When he camped about al-Shughr, he saw that it was powerful beyond all hope and not to be reached by any means. However, he ordered assaults to be made and a trebuchet to be erected to attack them. This was done and the trebuchet began to operate but only a few of its missiles, which did no damage, reached the castle. For some days the Muslims remained not considering that they had any hope, while the defenders were unconcerned at the fighting because they were protected from any harm that might touch them or any misfortune that might descend upon them.

While Saladin was sitting with his companions, engaged in conversation about the castle and what means one could use to reach it, one of them said, ‘This fortress is as God Almighty said, “They were not able to climb it nor were they able to dig through it.”’⁸ Saladin added, ‘Unless God brings help from himself and a victory.’ While they were talking thus, a Frank appeared before them and announced a request for a safe-conduct for an envoy to appear before Saladin. This was granted and an envoy descended and asked for a delay of three days. If no relieving force

⁶ The name is given in various forms, see Bahā’ al-Dīn, 85, note 1.

⁷ The text of *Kāmil* has al-Jamāhiratayn.

⁸ Koran, xviii, 96. This verse refers to the wall built by Dhū'l-Qarnayn (Alexander the Great) to keep out Gog and Magog.

came to them, they would surrender the castle with its contents, [13] stores, mounts and such like. He granted their request and took hostages from them for their good faith.

When the third day came, they yielded the fort to him. This fell on Friday 16 Jumādā II [12 August 1188]. The reason for their request for a delay was that they sent to Bohemond, the lord of Antioch, whose fortress this was, to tell him that they were besieged and asking him to raise the Muslims' siege. If he did not do so, they would give it up. They did this only because of the dread that God Almighty had cast into their hearts. Otherwise, had they stayed there for a long time, nobody would have reached them and the Muslims would not have achieved anything against them. After Saladin had taken over the fortress, he handed it to an emir called Qilij. He ordered him to refurbish it and then departed.

Account of the conquest of Sarmīniyya

When Saladin was occupied with these castles and fortresses, he sent his son al-Zāhir Ghāzī, lord of Aleppo, to besiege Sarmīniyya and blockade its inhabitants. He persuaded them to surrender on payment of a levy which he imposed upon them. After he had brought them down and taken the levy from them, he destroyed the fortress and effaced all trace of its lofty construction.

In this and these other castles there was a large crowd of Muslim captives. They were freed and provided with clothing and money. This conquest took place on Friday 23 Jumādā II [19 August 1188].

It happened that the conquest of this fortress and all the fortresses from Jabala to Sarmīniyya, despite [14] being so numerous, took place in six weeks although they were in the hands of the bravest of men and the most hostile to the Muslims. Praise be to the One who, when He wishes to facilitate what is difficult, does so. They were all dependencies of Antioch, which retained nothing but al-Qusayr, Baghrās and Darbsāk. These will be mentioned, God willing, in their place.

Account of the conquest of Barziyya

After Saladin had left al-Shughr, he went to the castle of Barziyya.⁹ It had already been described to him. It faces Apamea and shares with it the produce of its lands. Between the two of them is a lake which collects the waters of the Orontes and some springs which burst out from the mountain of Barziyya and others. Its inhabitants were a very grave danger to the Muslims, interrupting communications and doing excessive damage. On his arrival he camped to the east of it on 24 Jumādā II [20 August 1188]. The next day he rode around it to reconnoitre a place

⁹ i.e. Bourzey (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 79-84).

from which to attack it. He found none except on the western side. There he pitched a small tent for himself and camped in it, accompanied by part of the army without the baggage train because of the narrowness of the position.

This castle cannot be attacked at all from the north or the south. Nobody could climb its hill from these two directions. As for the east side, it was possible to climb it but not for anyone fighting, because of its height and steepness. On the west side, however, the valley that surrounded the castle's hill rose to a considerable height, so that it came close to the castle in that trebuchet missiles and arrows could reach it. The Muslims took this position and erected trebuchets there, but the defenders of the castle set up a trebuchet which put them out of action.

[15] From the top of a high hill that overlooked the castle, although it was not within range, I saw a woman operating a trebuchet from the castle. This was the one that put the Muslims' trebuchet [*sic*] out of action. When the sultan saw that they were gaining nothing from the trebuchet, he determined to make an assault and to overwhelm the defenders with his numbers. He divided the army into three parts. One would attack and if they tired and faltered, they would withdraw and the second group would engage. If *they* tired and lost heart, they would retire and the third group take over. This rota would continue time after time until the Franks became tired and exhausted, for they did not have sufficient numbers to dispose themselves similarly in shifts. If they tired and could not continue, they would surrender the castle.

On the next day, 27 Jumādā II [23 August], one of the groups, commanded by ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, lord of Sinjār, advanced for an assault. The Franks left their fortress and fought on their outwork. The Muslims shot at them with arrows from behind their palisades, screens and mantelets and moved towards them until they were close to the hill. When they drew near the Franks, they were unable fully to close with them because of the rude slope. The Franks, because of their commanding position, overwhelmed them with arrows and stones, for they were releasing large rocks to roll to the bottom of the hill, against which nothing could stand.

When this group became fatigued, they descended and the second group went up. They had been sitting, waiting their turn. They were Saladin's special guard (*halqa*) and they fought fiercely. It was a time of intense heat and the men's hardship was very great. Saladin, fully armed, circulated among them with encouragement. Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew, did likewise. This group engaged the Franks until near midday, then became tired and withdrew. When Saladin saw that they had retired, he advanced towards them, mace in hand, to drive them back. He then cried out to the third group, who were sitting, awaiting their turn. They leapt up willingly, came to the aid of their comrades and attacked with them. The Franks were met by more than they could withstand. The troops [16] of ‘Imād al-Dīn had by now rested, so they also rose to join in. At that moment the situation became serious for the Franks and their hearts were in their mouths. They were extremely tired and worn out and their inability to continue fighting was obvious, as was their

being too weak to bear arms owing to the intensity of the heat and the battle. The Muslims got amongst them, so the Franks withdrew within the castle. However, our men entered along with them.

To the east of the castle a small detachment was in their tents. They realized that the Franks had neglected that side because they could see no troops there and so that they could concentrate on the side where Saladin was. That detachment climbed up and met with no resistance. They also scaled the castle on that other side and linked up with the Muslims who were entering with the Franks. They took the castle by force of arms. The Franks entered the castle's keep, which was surrounded by the Muslims who wished to mine it.

The Franks had taken the Muslim captives they had up onto the roof of the keep with their legs in chains and pierced planks of wood. When they heard the Muslims' cry of 'God is great!' in the environs of the castle, they themselves made that cry on the keep's roof. The Franks imagined that the Muslims had already climbed onto the roof, so yielded and submitted to being made prisoner. The Muslims took the place by force and plundered its contents. They captured and enslaved those within, taking its lord and his family. It became deserted without any inhabitant. The Muslims set fire to some of its buildings and they burnt down.¹⁰

One of the most remarkable tales of escape [from peril] is the following. At this castle I saw a Muslim who had left one group of believers to the north of the castle to join another group of Muslims south of the castle, running around the contour of the hill. Rocks were loosed at him. A large rock came towards him, which, had it hit him, would have crushed him. It came down towards him and our men cried out to warn him. He looked around to see what was the matter, stumbled and fell on his face. 'Good heavens!' they exclaimed.¹¹ The rock came on and when it was near him, as he lay sprawled on his face, it collided with another rock fixed firmly in the ground above the man. The descending rock struck it and bounded into the air, passed over the man and came back to earth on the other side of him, having done him no harm or damage. He stood up and ran to join his comrades. [17] His fall was the cause of his escape. 'And the coward's mother perished!'¹²

The lord of Barziyya was taken captive, he and also his wife and children, among whom was a daughter whose husband was with her. The troops separated them and Saladin immediately sent to seek them out and purchased them and united them one with another. When he approached Antioch, he freed them and

¹⁰ Saladin granted Barziyya to 'Izz al-Dīn Ibrāhīm, son of Ibn al-Muqaddam (*Conquête*, 139–40).

¹¹ In Arabic expressed by the verb *istarja'a*, i.e. to use the conventional phrase signifying dismay 'To God do we belong and to Him do we return'.

¹² Although this is, as it appears, a proverb, it cannot be found in the standard collections and its significance can hardly be guessed at. The only proverb with any connection is 'A coward's mother is neither happy nor sad' (al-Maydānī, *Amthāl al-'arab*, i, 101).

sent them there. The wife of the lord of Barziyya was the sister-in-law of Bohemond,¹³ lord of Antioch. She was in correspondence with Saladin and exchanged gifts with him. She used to inform him of many significant matters. He freed these people for her sake.

Account of the conquest of Darbsāk

After the conquest of the castle of Barziyya, Saladin departed on the following day and came to Jisr al-Hadīd (Iron Bridge) on the Orontes in the vicinity of Antioch. He waited there until he was joined by the stragglers of his army and then marched to the castle of Darbsāk. He descended upon it on 8 Rajab [2 September 1188]. It was one of the strong castles and fortresses of the Templars which they kept garrisoned and supplied for their protection when misfortunes struck.

Having camped about it, he erected trebuchets and kept up a bombardment of rocks, which demolished a small part of the wall without causing the defenders any concern. He ordered an assault and for it to be pressed hard. The troops hastened to carry out the assault and attacked it strongly. They swept the men from the wall and the sappers advanced, mined a tower and prepared it for firing. The tower collapsed and the breach through which the soldiers hoped to enter was wide. For that day they then withdrew but renewed the assault early the next day.

The defenders had already sent a message to the lord of Antioch asking for aid. They held out [18] and showed fortitude, while waiting for the arrival of his reply, either that he would send them relief and drive the Muslims away or that he abandoned them to their fate, so that their excuse for surrender would stand up. After they learnt that he was unable to come to their help and they feared the outright attack of the Muslims, their putting them to the sword, their killing or capturing them and the plunder of their possessions, they asked for terms. Saladin gave them terms on condition that nobody should leave with anything but the clothes he was wearing, with no money, weapons, house furniture, mount or anything else there. Later he led them out and escorted them to Antioch. Its conquest was on 19 Rajab [13 September].¹⁴

Account of the conquest of Baghrās

From Darbsāk Saladin proceeded to the castle of Baghrās and besieged it after his staff had disagreed amongst themselves whether to do so. Some advised it but

¹³ She was the sister of Bohemond III's second wife, Sibylla.

¹⁴ According to 'Imād al-Dīn on 19 Rajab the defenders asked for terms and to be allowed to refer to Antioch. The actual surrender was on Friday 22 Rajab/16 September (*Conquête*, 142).

others spoke against it, saying, 'It is a powerful and impregnable castle, close to Antioch. There is no difference between besieging the one or the other. Most of the army will have to be in a detached formation to counter Antioch. If that is so, there will be few soldiers to attack the castle and then it will be impossible to get at it.' However, Saladin sought guidance from God and went to Baghrās. He posted most of his army as a detached force to face Antioch and raid its districts. They were very cautious, fearing the troops of Antioch, if they failed to be vigilant, because they were close by. Meanwhile Saladin with part of his troops engaged the castle and set up trebuchets but had no effect on it at all because of its height and elevated position. The opinion began to gain ground that it would be difficult and a lengthy matter to conquer it. The Muslims suffered from their lack of water, although Saladin set in place troughs and ordered water to be brought to them. This alleviated the situation for the men.

[19] While this was the case, the castle gate was opened and out came a man, asking for a safe-conduct for a parley. This was granted and he was allowed to present himself. He requested terms for the defenders so that they could surrender the castle with its contents to Saladin on the same basis as Darbsāk. Their request was granted. The envoy returned, taking with him the Islamic banners, which were raised over the top of the castle. The defenders came down and the Muslims took it over with the stores, money and weapons that it contained.¹⁵ Saladin ordered its destruction, which was done. This was a great loss to the Muslims, for the son of Leon, the ruler of the Armenians, came to it from his lands, for he was a neighbour, and repaired and restored it. He stationed some of his troops there, from where they raided Muslim territory. The hinterland of Aleppo suffered from them. Until the present time it remains in their hands.

Account of the truce between the Muslims and the ruler of Antioch

After Saladin had taken Baghrās, he determined to move against Antioch and put it under siege. Its lord, Bohemond, was very fearful of this and sent to Saladin, asking for a truce. He offered the release of every Muslim prisoner he had. Saladin consulted the regional rulers and others who were with him and the majority advised that he should accept this, to allow the troops to go home, rest and renew what they needed. He therefore agreed and they made a truce for eight months, beginning 1 Tishrīn I [1 October 1188] and ending 31 Ayyār [31 May]. He sent his envoy to the lord of Antioch to take his oath and to release the prisoners he had.

The lord of Antioch at this time was the greatest of the Franks and their most extensive ruler, because the Franks after the death of the Count had given him Tripoli and all its dependencies in addition to what he had already, as the Count

¹⁵ The surrender took place on 2 Sha'bān/26 September 1188 and both Baghrās and Darbsāk were given over to Emir 'Alam al-Dīn Sulaymān (*Conquête*, 143).

had left no child. When Tripoli was handed to him, he appointed his eldest son there as his deputy.¹⁶

[20] Saladin returned to Aleppo on 3 Sha'bān [27 September 1188]. He visited it and then went on to Damascus. He dismissed the eastern troops, such as [those of] 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī ibn Mawdūd, lord of Sinjār and Khābūr, the troops of Mosul and of elsewhere. After that he travelled to Damascus from Aleppo, taking his route by the tomb of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz,¹⁷ which he visited. He paid a visit to the pious shaykh Abū Zakariyyā' al-Maghribī, who was resident there. He was one of the pious servants of God, the worker of manifest miracles.

With Saladin was the Emir 'Izz al-Dīn Abū'l-Fulayta Qāsim ibn al-Muhannā al-'Alawī al-Ḥusaynī, the emir of Medina, [the city] of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace). He had joined his entourage and witnessed with him his battles and victories. Saladin had considered himself blessed to see him and fortunate to have his company. He showed him much honour, was friendly with him and consulted his opinion on all matters.

At the beginning of the month of Ramadān [24 October 1188] Saladin entered Damascus. He was advised to dismiss the troops but he said, 'Life is short and our allotted end is unsure. The following castles are still in the hands of the Franks, Kawkab, Safed, Kerak and others. We must finish them off, for they are in the middle of Muslim territory and there is no guarantee against the wickedness of their garrisons. If we neglect them now, we shall repent later.' God knows best!

Account of the conquest of Kerak and the neighbourhood

Saladin had stationed a force at Kerak to besiege it. They maintained the siege all this long time until the supplies and stores of the Franks were exhausted and they had eaten their animals, having endured until endurance was no longer possible. They made contact with al-'Ādil, Saladin's brother, [21] whom he had left at the castle of Kerak¹⁸ with a detachment of the army to besiege it and to watch this region of the country when he himself was far off in the direction of Darbsāk and Baghrās. The Frankish envoys came to him from Kerak with an offer to surrender the castle and a request for terms. He agreed to this and sent instructions on the matter to the commander of the besieging force, who took over the castle and gave them safe-conduct.

¹⁶ Tripoli was initially willed to Raymond, eldest son of Bohemond III, but was transferred to his younger brother, Bohemond IV (*Runciman*, ii, 470).

¹⁷ 'Umar II, the Umayyad caliph who ruled 717–20 A.D. His tomb was in the mosque at Ma'arrat al-Nu'mān.

¹⁸ One Ms. has Tibnīn here and this is supported by *Fath*, 161, which states that 'al-'Ādil was residing at Tibnīn' and that a relative of his by marriage, Sa'd al-Dīn Kamshabah al-Asadī, was in immediate charge at Kerak. Note too that the Frankish envoys have to travel from Kerak to meet al-'Ādil.

He also received the surrender of the neighbouring castles, such as Shawbak, Hormuz, Wu‘ayra¹⁹ and Sila‘. His worries about this region were removed and Islam became firmly established there.²⁰ The hearts of the inhabitants of that region of the land, such as Jerusalem among other places, were relieved, for they had been apprehensive about the garrisons of those castles and fearful of the evil they could cause.

Account of the conquest of the castle of Safed

When Saladin arrived at Damascus and he was advised to dismiss the troops, he said, ‘It is essential to finish with Safed, Kawkab and others.’ He remained in Damascus until the middle of Ramadān [7 November 1188] and then left for Safed, which he put under siege and attacked. He set up trebuchets and maintained a constant volley of rocks and arrows night and day.

The defenders’ stores and victuals came close to being used up in the period during which they were besieged, for Saladin was blockading them, as we have mentioned. When they saw how determined Saladin was in his attack, they feared that he would remain until the food they had left, which was but little, was exhausted and they would be overwhelmed by force and perish or that they would become too weak to resist before their food ran out and they would be overrun. They sent to request terms [22] which Saladin granted. He received the castle from them²¹ and they left and proceeded to Tyre. Thus God saved the believers from their evil, for they were in the centre of Muslim lands.

Account of the conquest of Kawkab

When Saladin was besieging Safed, the Franks in Tyre met together and said, ‘If the Muslims conquer the castle of Safed, Kawkab will not survive, even were it attached to Venus! [*al-kawkab*]²² Then our hopes for this part of our lands will be thwarted.’ They reached a decision to send a relief force secretly, men, weapons and other things. They sent out two hundred men, brave and stalwart Franks, who travelled by night under cover and spent the day lying low.

¹⁹ Situated in the Wadi Musa and known to the Franks as Li Vaux Moise (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 25–27).

²⁰ See *Conquête*, 148–9, for comments on the achieving of security for the Hijāz and the route for pilgrims.

²¹ On 8 Shawwāl/30 November 1188 and it was given to Shujā‘ al-Dīn Ṭughril al-Jāndār (*Fath*, 165; cf. *Conquête*, 152, note 1).

²² Ibn al-Athīr attributes unlikely word-play to the Franks. Cf. ‘Imād al-Dīn’s passage, ‘The master of the Hospital said, “It is our bright star (*kawkab*) etc.”’ (*Conquête*, 151).

It came about through God's decree that one of the Muslims besieging Kawkab went hunting and met a member of that relief force. He found his presence in that region strange, so beat him to make him tell him what he was doing and what had brought him there. He confessed to what he was and showed him where his comrades were. The Muslim soldier returned to Qaymāz al-Najmī, the commander of the besieging force, and told him the news, while the Frank was with him. The emir rode with a group of his troops to the place where the Franks were hiding, made a surprise attack on them, overwhelmed them and hunted them down in the thickets and caves. Not one of them escaped. Among them were two captains, knights of the Hospital. They were taken to Saladin when he was at Safed, who brought them forward to be killed. It was his custom to kill the Templars and the Hospitallers because of their intense hostility to the Muslims and their bravery. After he had ordered their execution, one of them said to him, 'I was not expecting any harm to befall us, once we had seen your blessed person and your handsome face.' Now he (God have mercy on him) was very merciful, affected by a plea or a winning entreaty to pardon or overlook faults. Therefore when he heard what they said, he did not execute them but ordered them to be imprisoned.

After the taking of Safed, Saladin went to Kawkab, which he invested and besieged. He sent to those Franks within offering them terms if they surrendered and threatening them with death, captivity and plunder if they refused. They did not heed his words but continued to hold out. He intensified his attacks, erected trebuchets and kept up a constant bombardment of rocks. He made assaults time after time. The rains were very heavy, falling without a break day and night. The Muslims were unable to fight in the manner they wished and their stay there became lengthy.

In the end they carried out assaults in numerous shifts during a single day and reached the castle's barbican along with sappers whom archers were protecting with arrows from hand-bows and cross-bows. Nobody was able to show his head above the wall. They mined the outwork and it collapsed. They advanced to the higher wall and when the Franks saw this, they announced their surrender and asked for terms, which were granted. Saladin took over the castle in the middle of Dhū'l-Qa'da [5 January 1189] and sent them to Tyre where they duly arrived.

Every valiant, devilish champion of the Franks gathered there. Their offensive power became great and their zeal burned brightly. They sent a succession of envoys to Andalusia, Sicily and other islands of the Mediterranean, seeking aid and reinforcements, while support was coming to them little by little. All this was due to Saladin's being remiss in releasing all whom he besieged, so that he ended up biting his thumb in regret and chagrin when that was of no use.

By the conquest of Kawkab and Safed the Muslims acquired everything from as far as Ayla to the furthest districts of Beirut with only the interruption of Tyre and also all the dependencies of Antioch, apart from al-Qusayr. After Saladin had taken Safed [*sic*], he went to Jerusalem, where he celebrated the Feast of

Sacrifices.²³ Later he left to go to Acre and remained there until the close of the year [ended 19 February 1189].

[24] Account of the emergence of a group of Shiites in Egypt

This year a Shiite group, in number twelve persons, revolted one night and proclaimed the watchword of the Alids, ‘O family of ‘Alī, O family of ‘Alī’. They wandered through the alleys with their cries, imagining that the city’s populace would respond to their call and rebel with them, that they would restore the Alid dynasty, bring out some of its members imprisoned in the palace and take control of the city. However, no-one paid any attention to them or gave them any hearing.

When they saw this, they dispersed in fear but they were taken. Saladin was told of this by letter and their attempt worried and disturbed him. The Qādī al-Fāḍil came to see him and told him what had happened, adding, ‘You ought to be happy at this, not sad and not be concerned, since you have learnt that in their hearts your subjects love you and are loyal and have abandoned any leaning towards your enemy. If you were to arrange for some people to do a similar sort of thing to ascertain the secret feelings of your followers and your subjects and expended large sums of money on them, it would be a small matter really [and worth it].’ This put his mind at rest.

This Qādī al-Fāḍil was the head of Saladin’s administration and the greatest man in it. His merits will be mentioned when his death is recorded, as you shall see.

Account of the defeat of the caliph’s army by Sultan Tughril

During this year the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh equipped a large army, appointing as its commander his vizier, Jalāl al-Dīn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus, and sent it to help Qizil to keep Sultan Tughril away from the country. The army marched on 3 Ṣafar [3 April 1188] until it drew close to Hamadhan. Qizil failed to join them and Tughril approached them with his troops. They clashed on 8 Rabī‘ I [7 May 1188] [25] at Dāy Marj near Hamadhan in a pitched battle. The army of Baghdad did not hold firm but fled in rout. The vizier stood his ground, bearing a copy of the Koran and a sword. Some of Tughril’s troop came and took him prisoner and seized the stores, weapons, animals and such like that he had. His army in scattered remnants returned to Baghdad.

At that time I was in Syria with Saladin’s army with the intention of participating in the Jihad. He received news of the departure of the Baghdad army

²³ He came to Jerusalem on Friday 8 Dhū'l-Hijja/= 27 January 1189 and celebrated the Feast on the following Sunday (*Fath*, 168; cf. *Conquête*, 153).

from his couriers and said, ‘I can foresee your bringing the news of their defeat’. Someone present asked him, ‘How is that?’ ‘There is no doubt,’ he replied, ‘that my men and my family know more about war than the vizier and have a more obedient following among the army than he does. Nevertheless, I do not send one of them in a squadron to war without fearing for him. This vizier is not knowledgeable about war and is new to wielding authority. The emirs do not consider him fit to be obeyed and he has personally undertaken to make war on a valiant sultan. Who with him will obey him?’ This was how the matter turned out. News came to him of their defeat and he said to his followers, ‘I told you such and such and reports of that have now arrived.’

When the troops of Baghdad returned in defeat, a poet, namely Ahmad ibn al-Wāthiq bi-Allāh, said:

Spare us these calamitous crimes, each face looking sickly.
 The vizier’s blessings have embraced us; thus our affairs are in good order!
 Our troops left, making for Khurasan, all in fine array,
 With horses, stores and equipment and old, well-tried swords,
 [26] A vizier, a single bow string, camels untended and horses ready for flight.
 They saw the cream of the enemy as they advanced,
 Then turned their backs and the knot of resolve was loosed.
 They returned to us and not with Hunayn’s boots,
 With faces black, ugly and bloody.
 If the Lord of Time saw and observed their deeds and wicked crime,
 He would repay them all with punishment.
 That is sufficient disgrace imposed upon them.

By rights this account should have come earlier but we delayed it so that previous events could be recorded in succession, one after the other, because they are all interconnected.

Miscellaneous events

This year the following died:

Our teacher, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Suwayda al-Takrītī. He was knowledgeable in Ḥadīth and the author of some excellent writings.

Saljūqa Khātūn, daughter of Qiliq Arslān ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Qiliq Arslān and wife of the caliph. Previously she was the wife of Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān, the lord of Ḥiṣn [Kayfā]. After his death, she married the caliph, who had a great love for her which was manifest to everyone. He built a mausoleum over her tomb on the West Bank and alongside the mausoleum his celebrated hospice in al-Ramla.

‘Alā’ al-Dīn Tunāmish. His bier was carried to the shrine of al-Ḥusayn (peace be upon him).

Khāliṣ, the caliph’s eunuch. He was a very great emir in Baghdad.

Abū'l-Faraj ibn al-Naqūr, the notary, in Baghdad. He heard much Ḥadīth and was from a family of Ḥadīth scholars (God have mercy on him).

Account of the conquest of Shaqīf Arnūn

In Rabī‘ I of this year [April 1189] Saladin proceeded to Shaqīf Arnūn,¹ a very strong fortress, to put it under siege. Its lord, Reynald, lord of Sidon, came down to a meeting with Saladin, making a show of obedience and friendship. This Reynald was one of the cleverest and most devious of men. He said, ‘I have much love for you and I acknowledge your kindness, but I fear that the Marquis will learn of our relationship and as a result my children and my family will suffer at his hands, for they are with him now. I desire that you give me time to arrange for them to get away from him. Then I and they will come to you, surrender the castle to you and join your service. We shall be content with any fief you give us.’ Saladin thought that he spoke the truth, so agreed to what he asked. It was settled between them that he would surrender Shaqīf Arnūn in Jumādā II [17 July–14 August 1189].

Saladin remained in Marj ‘Uyūn, waiting for the agreed date but anxious and troubled because of the near expiration of the period of truce between himself and Bohemond, lord of Antioch. He ordered Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew, to move with his troops and those who would come from the eastern lands and take up a position facing Antioch to prevent its lord making any hostile inroad into Muslim territory at the end of the truce.

He was also disturbed in mind and full of worry at the news of the Franks’ gathering in the city [28] of Tyre and their constant receipt of reinforcements by sea, also at the fact that the king of the Franks, whom he had captured and then freed after the fall of Jerusalem, had come to terms with the Marquis after they had been at odds and that they had now assembled in numbers beyond counting for they had moved out of and beyond Tyre. All this and similar matters disturbed him and he feared to leave Shaqīf Arnūn in his rear and advance to Tyre, when abundant forces were there that could cut off his supplies. Nevertheless, despite these matters, he remained faithful to his agreement with Reynald, lord of Shaqīf Arnūn.

Meanwhile, during the period of truce, Reynald was buying from the camp market provisions, weapons and other things to strengthen his castle. Saladin was interpreting everything in the best light. When it was hinted to him that Reynald was engaged in deceit and that his aim was to temporize until the Franks emerged from Tyre and then reveal his shame and make his opposition clear, he would not

¹ The fortress of Beaufort overlooking the bend of the River Litani (see Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, 41–44). Saladin left Damascus on Friday 3 Rabī‘ I/21 April 1189 (*Conquête*, 159).

accept this. When the end of the truce was near, Saladin moved out of his camp to be close to Shaqīf Arnūn. He summoned Reynald to him, when three days were left before the agreed date, and spoke to him about the surrender of the castle. Reynald used his sons and family as an excuse, saying that the Marquis would not let them join him, and requested another period of delay. At that, Saladin realized his trickery and deception. He seized and detained him, ordering him to give up the castle. Reynald asked for a priest, whom he named, to carry a message to the men within that they should surrender. When he was brought to him, he whispered to him some instructions that the Muslims did not understand. This priest then went into the castle and the defenders made clear their intention to resist. Saladin sent Reynald to Damascus and put him in prison. He advanced close to Shaqīf Arnūn and blockaded it, placing men to watch it and keep out supplies and reinforcements.

[29] Account of the vanguard's encounter with the Franks

When Saladin was at Marj 'Uyūn and besieging Shaqīf Arnūn, he received letters from his men whom he had posted as advance scouts facing the Franks at Tyre, in which they reported to him that the Franks had agreed to cross the bridge that was at Tyre² and intended to besiege Sidon.³ With his brave followers, apart from those he put to watch Shaqīf Arnūn, Saladin set out without his baggage train but arrived only when he had missed the action.

The fact is that the Franks had already left Tyre and set out for their destination. The scouting force met them in a narrow passage there, engaged them and held them up. A fierce battle ensued, fit to turn an infant grey. They captured several of the Franks, killed several others, including seven of their celebrated knights, and wounded several. A number of the Muslims were also slain, among them a mamluke of Saladin, one of the bravest of men.⁴ He charged the Frankish line alone, got amongst them and laid about him with his sword to right and left, but they overpowered him and killed him (God have mercy upon him). The Franks were unable to reach Sidon, so retraced their steps to where they started.

Account of a second engagement for the volunteer Jihad warriors

After Saladin came to the scouting force, having missed the first encounter, he remained with them in a small tent, waiting for the return of the Franks to punish them and take revenge for the Muslims they had slain. One day he rode out in a

² This was a bridge over the River Litani about five miles north of Tyre.

³ This information was passed on Monday 17 Jumādā I/3 July, according to *Conquête*, 163.

⁴ This was a certain Aybak al-Akhrash (see *Conquête*, 164; Bahā' al-Dīn, 91-2).

small band to view the Frankish camp from the hill to act on the basis of what he would see. Some of the Arab and non-Arab volunteer fighters there thought that he was intending a pitched battle. They proceeded enthusiastically and penetrated deep into enemy ground, [30] abandoning prudence. They left the sultan in their rear and drew close to the Franks. Saladin dispatched a number of emirs to bring them back and protect them until they were safely away, but they did not listen or comply.

The Franks first believed that there was an ambush behind them, so did not advance towards them. They sent men to see the true position. News came back that they were isolated from the Muslims and that there was nothing to fear behind them. So the Franks charged them as one man and engaged them in battle. They were not long in laying them all low. Several men of note among them were slain. What had befallen them dismayed Saladin and the Muslims. This came about through their excessive self-confidence (may God have mercy on them and be pleased with them).

This engagement took place on 19 Jumādā I⁵ [5 July 1189]. When Saladin saw what was happening he came down from the hill with his troops and they charged the Franks, threw them back to the bridge and seized their route. The Franks cast themselves into the water. About a hundred men in armour were drowned, not to mention those that were slain. The sultan planned to persevere in the encounter and to press them hard. Our men heard the news and came to him from every direction, until a large host had assembled with him. When the Franks saw this, they withdrew to the city of Tyre and when they had done so, Saladin went to Tibnīn and then to Acre to inspect its state [of defence]. Later he returned to the army and the camp.⁶

Account of a third engagement

After Saladin had returned to the army, he received news that the Franks were leaving Tyre to gather firewood and forage in scattered groups. He wrote to the troops in Acre and fixed a rendezvous with them for Monday 8 Jumādā II [24 July 1189] to engage the enemy from both directions. He placed an ambush at a spot in those gulleys and thickets. He selected a group of his bravest troops [31] and ordered them to harrass the Franks and, if the Franks charged them, to resist a little, then pretend to flee and make them think that they were incapable of fighting them. When the Franks pursued them, they should draw them on until they were past where the ambush was placed. They should then wheel around on them and the ambush emerge behind them. They duly set out with this plan.

⁵ *Kāmil* has 9 Jumādā I here, but *Conquête*, 164, and Bahā' al-Dīn, 92, agree on Wednesday 19 Jumādā I. *Conquête* converts this in error to 6 July.

⁶ Saladin was back in his camp by Saturday 6 Jumādā II/22 July 1189 (*Conquête*, 166).

When the two bodies saw one another and the two sides met and fought, the Muslim cavalry were too proud to be seen even in feigned flight, so held their ground and fought. Both sides stood firm and the battle became intense and major in scale. The conflict lasted a long time and the men in ambush, unable to bear the long wait, feared for their comrades, left their positions to hurry towards them and join them. They came to them while they were fiercely engaged and the action became ever more fierce. There were four emirs from Rabi'a and Tayy among them, who did not know this country and did not follow their comrades' route. They followed a valley, thinking that it would lead them out to their comrades. One of Saladin's mamlukes followed them. When the Franks saw them in the valley, they realized that they were lost, so closed with them in battle. The mamluke dismounted, sat on a rock, took his bow in his hands and defended himself. The Franks began shooting crossbow bolts at him and he shot at them. He wounded several and they inflicted many wounds on him. He fell and they came to him when he was at his last gasp. They left him and went away, thinking him dead. The next day the Muslims came to this place, buried⁷ their dead but saw the mamluke to be alive. They carried him on a cloak, hardly recognizable because of his many wounds. They despaired of his life and turned away from him, having heard his confession of faith and congratulated him as a martyr. They left him but when they returned, they saw that he had rallied. They brought him drink and he recovered. Subsequently he would never attend any battle without performing great deeds.⁸

[32] Account of the Franks' march to Acre and their besieging it

The Franks had gathered in great numbers at Tyre, as we have mentioned, in that, whenever Saladin conquered a city or a castle, he gave the inhabitants terms and sent them there with their property, women and children and thus a huge multitude, in numbers quite beyond counting, gathered there and vast amounts of money, inexhaustible despite great expenditure over many years. The monks, priests and a large number of their nobles and knights donned black and declared their grief at the loss of Jerusalem. The patriarch, who had been in Jerusalem, brought them together and took them into the Frankish lands to travel around with them as they sought the people's aid and succour and urged them to take vengeance for Jerusalem. They portrayed the Messiah (peace be upon Him) along with an Arab, depicted as beating him. They put blood on the portrait of the Messiah and said to people, 'This is the Messiah with Muhammad, the prophet of the Muslims, beating him. He has wounded and slain Him.'

⁷ Following the variant reading (*fa-wārū*), which is preferable to the edition's *fa-ra'ū* (saw).

⁸ His name was Aybak al-Sāqī and 'Imād al-Dīn explains that this experience made him braver and more eager to fight the infidel (*Conquête*, 168).

The Franks were much distressed. They answered the call in great numbers, even the women, for there were with them at Acre a number of women, competing with their fellows, as we shall narrate, God willing. Those that were unable to depart hired people to go in their place or they gave money according to their circumstances. There gathered around them more men and money than there would be any way of counting.

A Muslim dwelling in Ḥiṣn al-Akrād, one of the soldiers of its rulers who in former times surrendered it to the Franks, told me his tale. This individual repented of his former cooperation with the Franks in raiding Islamic lands, his fighting and working [33] with them. The reason for my meeting with him I shall relate under the year 590 [1193–4], if God Almighty wills.⁹ This man told me that along with a group of Franks from Ḥiṣn al-Akrād he visited the Frankish and Greek lands over the seas in four galleys to seek reinforcements. He said, ‘Our travels finally took us to Rome, which we left with our galleys full of bullion.’

A certain Frankish captive told me that he was his mother’s only son. They possessed no worldly goods other than a house which she sold and used the purchase money to equip him and send him to free [Jerusalem] and that he was taken prisoner. This is an extreme example of the religious and spiritual motivation that the Franks had. They came forth on every variety of mount, by land and by sea, from every nook and cranny. Had God not shown his grace to the Muslims and destroyed the king of the Germans at his appearance in Syria after he had left home, as we shall recount, people would be saying, ‘Syria and Egypt used to belong to the Muslims’. This explains why they left their homes.

When they had assembled at Tyre, they clashed against one another like billowing waves.¹⁰ They had great wealth and the sea was supplying them from their homelands with provisions and stores, equipment and men. Tyre became too small for them, both within and without, so they planned to attack Sidon, as we have mentioned, but they drew back from that. They then agreed to march against Acre and to subject it to a determined siege. Having set out with all their forces, cavalry and infantry, on their march they stayed close to the sea, not leaving it whether the way was easy or hard, narrow or broad. Their ships shadowed them at sea, carrying their weapons and stores, to be their support, so that, if they were met by an overwhelming force, they could embark and return. They set out on 8 Rajab [22 August 1189] and descended on Acre the middle of the month [29 August]. While they were on the move, the Muslims’ forward unit harassed them and seized any straggler.

After they had set out, news that they had done so came to Saladin and he moved to be in contact with them. Then [34] he gathered his emirs and consulted them whether they should proceed opposite the Franks and engage them on the

⁹ Unfortunately this promise appears to have been forgotten.

¹⁰ There is an echo here of Koran, xviii, 100, with a reference to the irruption of Gog and Magog or the teeming Day of Judgment.

march or whether they should follow a different route from the one the Franks took. They replied, 'There is no need for us to put up with the hardship of shadowing them, for the route is difficult and narrow and there is no chance of any advantage for us. The best plan is for us to follow the high road and meet them at Acre, where we shall scatter and destroy them.'

Saladin realized their inclination was for a short-term rest, so went along with them. His own idea was to shadow them and fight them as they proceeded. He said, 'If the Franks once come to camp, they will cling to their position. There will be no chance for us to dislodge them and no gaining the upper hand over them. The right idea is to fight them before they reach Acre.' They did not agree and he followed them. They went by way of Kafar Kannā, so the Franks arrived before them. Saladin had appointed a few emirs opposite the Franks to follow their movements and harass them with skirmishes. The Franks made no move against them despite their small numbers. Had the whole force followed Saladin's plan to shadow the Franks and engage them before they descended upon Acre, he would have achieved his purpose and blocked their progress but, when God wills a matter, he prepares its means.

When Saladin arrived at Acre, he saw that the Franks had already invested it from the sea to the sea on the other side and that the Muslims had no means of access to it. Saladin made camp to blockade them and pitched his own tent on Tell Kaysān. His right wing extended to Tell al-'Ayyādiyya and his left to the permanent river.¹¹ The baggage trains stopped at Ṣaffūriyya. He also sent letters to the provinces summoning troops. Mosul's troops came, as did those of Diyār Bakr, Sinjār and other places in the Jazīra. Then Taqī al-Dīn, his nephew, and Muẓaffar al-Dīn ibn Zayn al-Dīn, the lord of Harrān and Edessa, joined him.

Supplies used to reach the Muslims overland and the Franks by sea. Between the two sides during their stay at Acre many battles took place, both small and large, some of them celebrated days of battle and some less so. I shall give an account of the great days to avoid being over long [35] and because the others were minor engagements of limited forces, which it is not necessary to mention.

When Saladin surrounded the Franks, he was unable to get to them or to Acre until the end of the month of Rajab. He then engaged them the first day of Sha'bān [14 September 1189] but did not achieve what he hoped. The troops spent the night in battle lines and when the morning came he attacked them early with all his might. He completely encircled them from early morning until midday. Both sides held steady in a manner that amazed the beholder.

At midday Taqī al-Dīn carried out a redoubtable charge from the right wing against those opposite him and dislodged them from their positions, as they rode one another down, every man for himself. They took refuge with their comrades

¹¹ Tell Kaysān: 'an isolated mound 5 miles (8 km) south-east of Acre'. Tell al-'Ayyādiyya was 'at the Acre end of an east-west ridge that marks the northern boundary of the plain'. The river is the Na'mān, the classical Belus (Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 300).

next to them, gathered with them for protection. They left half the city accessible and Taqī al-Dīn occupied their position and made contact with the city. He held on to what they had abandoned and the Muslims were able to enter and leave the city. Access was established and the blockade of the inhabitants lifted. Saladin sent in all the men, stores, money, armaments and whatever else he wanted. Had the Muslims persevered with the fight until nightfall, they would have gained what they desired, for the first clash brings panic, but, after they had achieved this much, they were disposed to rest and ceased to fight. They said, 'We shall attack them tomorrow morning and eliminate them.'

Among the men whom Saladin sent in to Acre, among the emirs, was Ḥusām al-Dīn Abū'l-Hayjā', one of the great emirs of his army. He was a Ḥakamī Kurd from Irbil. A great many of the Franks were killed this day.

[36] Account of another battle and the Bedouins' engagement

The following day, 6 Sha'bān [19 September 1189], the Muslims took on the Franks again, determined to try their hardest and to exert every effort to eradicate them. They advanced in battle order but they saw that the Franks were cautious and on their guard, regretful for their carelessness of the day before. They had protected their flanks and their lines and begun to dig a ditch to prevent access to them. The Muslims persisted in their attacks but the Franks made no forward movement and did not leave their emplacements. Seeing this, the Muslims withdrew.

Later a band of Arabs heard that the Franks were coming out on the other side to gather firewood and for other purposes. They lay in wait for them in the bends and on the banks of the river on 16 Sha'bān [29 September]. When a group of Franks emerged, following their normal practice, the Arabs charged them and slew them to the last man, taking what they had as booty. They brought the heads to Saladin, who rewarded them and gave them robes of honour.

Account of a major battle at Acre

After this battle which we have mentioned, the Muslims continued every day until 20 Sha'bān [= 4 October¹² 1189] to engage the Franks morning and evening, while the Franks remained in their camp and did not leave it. The Franks gathered for a council and said, 'The army of Egypt has not yet come and our situation with Saladin is as it is. How will it be when they arrive? [37] Our best plan is to confront the Muslims tomorrow in the hope that we shall defeat them before their armies concentrate and reinforcements come.'

¹² That it was a Wednesday is specified in *Fath*, 197 (given as 3 October in *Conquête*, 178).

Much of Saladin's army was absent; a part was opposite Antioch to prevent any hostile move from its lord Bohemond against the lands of Aleppo, another part was at Homs facing Tripoli to watch that front, one force was opposite Tyre to protect lands there, another in Egypt to garrison the ports of Damietta and Alexandria among others and the remaining Egyptian troops had not yet arrived because of their long time on campaign, as we have mentioned before. This was one of the things that encouraged the Franks to come out to engage the Muslims.

The Muslims began their morning as usual; some moved forward to fight, some were in their tents and others had gone about their business, visiting a friend or acquiring what they, their companions or their mounts required and other such matters. Then, like a plague of locusts, creeping across the face of the earth, which they filled far and wide, the Franks emerged from their camp and made for the Muslim right wing, which was led by Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar, Saladin's nephew. When he saw the Franks advancing towards him, he and his men took precautions. They came towards him and when they drew near, he retired.

When Saladin, who was in the centre, saw the situation, he reinforced Taqī al-Dīn with men of his own to give him some support. The troops from Diyār Bakr and some of the easterners were on the wing of the centre. When the Franks saw how few were the men in the centre and that many of them had moved towards the right wing to support it, they turned on the centre and made a charge as one man. Our detachments gave way before them in disorder, although some men stayed firm. Several met a martyr's death, such as Emir Mujallī ibn Marwān, Zahīr al-Dīn, brother of the Lawyer 'Isā, who was governor of Jerusalem, a man who combined bravery [at arms], learning and piety, the Chamberlain Khalil al-Hakkārī and other brave men, [38] steadfast on the field of war. There was none left facing them in the centre to drive them back. They made for the hill on which was Saladin's tent, killed those they passed and seized plunder. At Saladin's tent they killed several, among them our teacher, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī ibn Rawāḥa al-Ḥamawī, a religious scholar and a good poet. There is a long history of martyrdom in the family, for his ancestor, 'Abd Allāh ibn Rawāḥa, a companion of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace), was killed by the Byzantines at the battle of Mu'ta,¹³ while this member was slain by the Franks at the battle of Acre, as they slew others. They came down to the other side of the hill and put to the sword those they met. By the grace of God Almighty the Franks did not throw down Saladin's tents. Had they done so,¹⁴ our people would have known that they had reached it and that our troops had fled before them and there would have been a complete rout.

¹³ In 8/629 the Prophet sent an expedition northwards which was defeated at this village on the fringes of the desert, east of the Dead Sea.

¹⁴ Taking the variant reading *alqaw-hā* (threw it down), rather than the main text's *laqū-hā* (met it).

The Franks then looked behind them and saw that their support was separated from them, so they withdrew, fearing that they might be cut off from their comrades. The reason why they were separated was that our right wing stood facing them and some of them needed to stop to counter them. The Muslim left wing charged the Franks and their supporting troops, by engaging with them, were distracted from linking up with their fellows and returned to the line of their trenches. Our left wing then charged the Franks who had reached Saladin's tent and clashed with them as they were withdrawing. A battle followed and the army's pages rose and tackled them.

When the centre fled, Saladin had pursued them, calling out to them and ordering them to come back and renew the fight. A good number of them did rally around him and he led them in an attack on the rear of the Franks as they were involved in fighting the left wing. The swords of God overwhelmed them from every side and not one of them escaped. Most were killed and the rest were taken prisoner. Amongst those taken was the master of the Templars whom Saladin had captured and freed. When he now [39] seized his person, he put him to death. Those slain, apart from those who were beside the sea, were about 10,000 in number. Saladin ordered them to be thrown into the river from which the Franks drank. Most of the dead were Frankish knights, for the infantry had not caught up with them. Among the prisoners were three Frankish women, who had been fighting on horseback. After they had been captured and their armour thrown off, it was discovered that they were women.

As for the Muslims who had fled, some of them came back from [as far as] Tiberias,¹⁵ some had crossed the Jordan before returning and others went as far as Damascus. Had these units not scattered in rout, they would have achieved their aim of totally eliminating and destroying the Franks. However, the rest did their utmost, fought fiercely and resolved to enter the Franks' camp along with them, hoping that they might cause them to panic. Then the cry reached them that their baggage and property had been ransacked. The reason for this plunder was that our men, when they saw the rout, loaded their baggage on the pack animals. The camp menials and the pages rioted and plundered and ran off with the baggage. It was Saladin's plan to renew the attack and the assault the next day but he saw that the men were preoccupied with the property that they had lost and were striving to gather it together and secure it. He ordered a proclamation that what had been taken should be brought back. Enough furnishings, full saddlebags, garments, weaponry and such like were handed in to fill the earth. All was restored to its owners. That day Saladin missed the opportunity to achieve his aim, for the Franks' panic subsided and they mended the state of the survivors amongst them.

¹⁵ 'Imād al-Dīn admits that he was one of the many who fled to Tiberias, thinking that all was lost (*Conquête*, 180–81).

Account of Saladin's withdrawal from the Franks and their becoming in a position to blockade Acre

After that large number of Franks had been slain, the earth became unwholesome from the stink of the corpses and the corruption of the air and the atmosphere. Men's health worsened and Saladin became indisposed; [40] he suffered from a recurring painful colic. His emirs attended him and advised him to move from that place and to abandon close pressure on the Franks. They presented this to him as the best course, saying, 'We have pressed the Franks hard and even if they wanted to leave their position, they could not. Our best plan is to move away so that they can pack up and leave. If they do depart – and this is the likely outcome – then we are spared their trouble and they ours! If they stay, we can return to the battle and get back to where we were before. Moreover, your health is bad and your pain intense. If any rumour of that got abroad, our men would be lost. By every calculation our best plan is to withdraw from them.' The doctors concurred in this, so he accepted it to do what was God's will. 'When God wills a people harm, there is no turning it away. They have no protector apart from Him.'¹⁶ So they withdrew to al-Kharrūba on 4 Ramadān [= 17 October 1189]. Saladin ordered the Muslim defenders in Acre to hold it, close the gates and take all precautions, and he told them the reason for his withdrawal.

After he and his troops had withdrawn, the Franks felt secure and spread over that area, once again besieging Acre, encompassing it from sea to sea, while their ships also blockaded it at sea. They began to dig a ditch and built up a rampart from the earth they took out from the ditch. What they achieved was beyond expectation. Our screening force used to face them every day but they would not fight or make any move. They were concerned only with making the ditch and the rampart for their protection from Saladin, if he returned to the battle. At this time the plan of those who had advised this withdrawal became clear.¹⁷

[41] Every day the forward detachment was informing Saladin of what the Franks were doing, exaggerating the situation, although Saladin was concerned with his illness and unable to undertake military operations. A certain person¹⁸ advised him to send all the troops to prevent the Franks from [working on] the ditch and the rampart and to engage them in hostilities, but to retire himself. He replied, 'If I am not present with them, they do nothing and perhaps the evil will be many times more than the good we hope for.' The operation was delayed until Saladin had recovered, so the Franks were able to build what they wanted, put their affairs on a firm footing and fortified themselves with whatever they found available. Meanwhile the men in Acre were making daily sorties, engaging the Franks and causing them casualties outside the city.

¹⁶ Koran, xiii, 13.

¹⁷ This is presumably referring to 'Imād al-Dīn's comment that the emirs inclined towards the course that meant less trouble and effort for them. See *Conquête*, 189.

¹⁸ None other than 'Imād al-Dīn himself, as he records in *Conquête*, 190.

Account of the arrival of the Egyptian forces and, at sea, of the Egyptian fleet

The middle of Shawwāl [26 November 1189] the Egyptian forces arrived, commanded by al-Ādil Sayf al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb. When he arrived, he and those with him raised the spirits of the men whose backs were stiffened. He brought with him a large quantity of siege equipment, breastplates, shields, bows and arrows, and also a large number of infantry. Saladin gathered from Syrian lands much manpower, determined to attack the enemy with both horse and foot.

Afterwards the Egyptian fleet arrived, commanded by the Emir Lu'lu', who was energetic, brave, bold, knowledgeable of the sea and naval warfare and blessed with good fortune. He came unexpectedly and fell upon a large transport ship of the Franks which he plundered, taking from it large sums of money and abundant supplies. He brought her into Acre. The arrival of the fleet calmed the inhabitants' minds and strengthened their hearts.

[42] Miscellaneous events

In Ṣafar of this year [21 March-18 April 1189] Abū Naṣr Muḥammad, the son of the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, was proclaimed as heir apparent in Baghdad. Dinars and dirhams were scattered. Letters were sent out to the various lands about establishing the khutbah [in his name] and this was done.

In Shawwāl [12 November-10 December 1189] the caliph took Takrīt. The reason for this was that the ruler there, Emir Īsā, was killed by his brothers who seized the citadel after him. The caliph sent an army against them which besieged the citadel and took it over. His officers entered Baghdad and were given fiefs.

Also in Ṣafar [21 March-18 April 1189] the hospice which the caliph built on the West Bank at Baghdad, was opened. A huge crowd attended and it was a memorable day.

This year the following died:

In Ramadān [13 October-11 November 1189] Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Sa'd 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Hibat Allāh ibn Abī 'Aṣrūn, the Shāfi'i lawyer, in Damascus. He was cadi there but became blind. He was succeeded in office by his son. He was the leading figure among the notables of the Shāfi'i lawyers.

In Dhū'l-Qa'da [11 December 1189-9 January 1190] the Lawyer Ḏiyā' al-'Dīn Īsā al-Hakkārī, while at al-Kharrūba with Saladin. He was one of the leading emirs of the army, a former member of the Asadiyya. He was a lawyer and a soldier, brave and generous, a man of loyalty and manliness. He was a student of the Shaykh, Imam Abū'l-Qāsim ibn al-Bazrī,¹⁹ with whom he studied law in Jazīrat Ibū 'Umar. He then joined Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh and became an imam for him.

¹⁹ Correct the text's al-B.r.zī. See above s.a. 560, p. [321].

Shirkūh saw enough of his courage to give him a fief and he advanced greatly in the service of Saladin.

Again in Şafar [21 March–18 April 1189], our teacher Abū'l-'Abbās Ahmad ibn 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Wahbān, [43] known as Ibn Afḍal al-Zamān,²⁰ at Mecca. He was (God have mercy on him) a learned man, a great scholar in many disciplines, the disputes within his school of law, the two sources²¹ [of dogma], mathematics, the Koranic inheritance shares, astrology, astronomy, logic and others. He crowned his good deeds with asceticism, wearing rough clothing, and a life as a pious resident in Mecca (may God protect her), where he passed away. As a companion and in his way of life he was one of the best.

In Dhū'l-Qa'da [11 December 1189–9 January 1190] Abū Ṭālib al-Mubārak ibn al-Mubārak al-Karkhī, the professor of the Niẓāmiyya. He was a student of Abū'l-Hasan ibn al-Khall and a righteous and good man, held in great respect and widely influential with the caliph and the common people. He was a noted calligrapher, whose skills were proverbial.

²⁰ i.e. son of the most learned of the age.

²¹ The Koran and the Sunna are intended.

Account of the battle of the Franks with the advance guard and of Saladin's return to the blockade of the Franks

We have already mentioned Saladin's withdrawal from Acre to al-Kharrūba because of his illness. After he had recovered, he remained where he was until the winter had passed. Throughout his stay at al-Kharrūba his advance guard and his skirmishers were in constant contact with the Franks.

When Ṣafar of this year 586 came [10 March-7 April 1190], the Franks heard that Saladin had gone hunting and they saw that his advance guard near them were few in number and that there was much boggy ground on the plain of Acre to prevent the passage of any who wished to come to the support of the advance guard. They seized this opportunity and came from their trench to attack the advance guard one evening. The Muslims fought back and defended themselves with arrows. The Franks held back until the arrows were exhausted and then charged them as one man. The battle raged fiercely and the position became serious. The Muslims realized that only their steadfastness and full-blooded fighting would save them. They fought desperately, facing death, until night fell, after a large number had been killed on both sides, and the Franks returned to their earthworks.

When Saladin returned to his camp, he heard the news of the battle and deputed men to go to the help of their brothers. News then reached him that the Franks had returned to their earthworks, so he remained where he was. Later he saw that winter was over and he was joined by the troops from nearby towns, Damascus, Homs, Hama and others. He then moved forward from al-Kharrūba towards Acre and camped at Tell Kaysān. He engaged the Franks [45] every day to distract them from attacking the Muslims in Acre. Thus the enemy were fighting on two fronts and not wearying.

Account of the burning of the siege towers and the fleet's battle

During the period of their stay at Acre the Franks had built three very tall towers of wood, each of which rose sixty cubits into the air. They constructed each tower with five storeys, each storey full of fighting men, having assembled timbers for them from the islands, for to build such great towers as these only rare and scarce timber is suitable. They covered them with skins, vinegar, clay and substances that would prevent their being consumed by fire. They levelled routes for them and moved them towards the city of Acre from three directions. On 20 Rabi' I [27 April

1190] they were used for an assault. They overtopped the wall and the soldiers within them fought the Muslims on the wall, driving them off it. They then commenced to fill in the moat and the city was on the point of being taken by force of arms.

The defenders sent out a man who swam to Saladin and informed him of the critical situation they were in and the imminent prospect of their being taken and killed. Saladin and his men mounted up and advanced towards the Franks, engaging them in continuous and fierce action to keep them too busy to press hard on the city. The Franks divided into two groups, one fighting Saladin and the other fighting the defenders of Acre. However, the situation was alleviated for the defenders. The battle lasted for eight consecutive days, ending on 28th of the month [5 May 1190]. Both sides tired of the fighting and wearied of its relentless [46] day and night. The Muslims became convinced that the Franks would overcome the city because they saw the inability of those within to repel the siege towers, for they left no trick untried but it was useless and benefited them not at all. They kept up a constant barrage of Greek fire but it had no effect. They were sure that they were doomed to destruction, but God came to their aid and allowed the towers to be burnt.

This came about because a man from Damascus was passionate about collecting equipment used by Greek fire specialists and acquiring ingredients that strengthen the action of fire. People who knew him used to blame him for this and disapprove of it but he would reply, 'This is not a practice I engage in myself but I just want to understand it.' It was for God's own purposes that he was in Acre. When he saw the towers erected to attack Acre, he began to make the highly combustible substances that he knew of, such that no clay, vinegar or anything else would resist. When he had finished, he came before Emir Qarāqūsh, who was in charge of affairs in Acre and the governor there, and said to him, 'Would you order the artificer to launch what I shall give him from the trebuchet facing one of these towers to set fire to it.' Now Qarāqūsh's exasperation and his fear for the city and its inhabitants were almost killing him. These words added to his exasperation. He turned on him angrily and said, 'These specialists have already done all they can in launching Greek fire and the like without success.' Someone present said, 'Perhaps God has arranged for our deliverance at this man's hands. It will not harm us to consent to what he says.' Qarāqūsh then agreed and ordered the artificer to do what he ordered. He launched several pots of oil and various substances without having ignited them. When the Franks saw that no pot set fire to anything, they yelled, danced and cavorted on the roof of the tower. Eventually, when he ascertained that what he had thrown had hit the tower, he shot a full pot, having ignited it. The tower was set aflame. He shot a second and a third and the fire blazed out in various parts of the tower and was too quick for the men on its five storeys to flee and save their lives. When they had seen the first pots have no effect, their arrogance had made them [47] feel secure and not bother to run for safety, so that God gave them an early taste of fire in this world before the next.

After the first tower was burnt, he moved to the second, from which the occupants had now fled in fear. He set that one on fire and likewise the third. It was a day to remember, the like of which had not been seen. The Muslims [outside] watched in delight, their faces lit up after their despair, in their joy at this victory and the Muslims' escape from slaughter, because there was not one amongst them who did not have either a relative or a friend in the city. This individual was taken to Saladin who offered him large sums of money and a substantial fief. However, he accepted not a single bean, saying, 'I did it just for God Almighty. From Him alone do I wish for reward.'¹

Letters were sent far and wide with news of this success. Saladin sent to ask for the eastern armies and the first to arrive was 'Imād al-Dīn Zankī ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, the lord of Sinjār and the lands of the Jazīra. Then came 'Alā' al-Dīn, the son of 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, whom his father, the lord of Mosul, had sent as commander of his army. The next to arrive was Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf, lord of Irbil. When each of them arrived, he would advance against the Franks with his troops, be joined by others, engage them in battle and then make camp.

The fleet arrived from Egypt. When the Franks heard of its approach, they sent out a fleet to intercept it and bring it to battle. Saladin rode out with all his troops and engaged the enemy from their side to prevent them by his action from engaging the [Muslim] fleet, so that it would be able to enter Acre, but they were not distracted from attacking it at all. The battle raged between the two sides by land and by sea. It was a day to remember, the like of which has never been recorded. The Muslims took a ship with all the men and weapons it contained from the Franks and the Franks took the like from the Muslims. Nevertheless, there were more killed among the Franks than among the Muslims. The Muslim fleet made harbour safely.

[48] Account of the German emperor's arrival in Syria and his death

This year the emperor² of the Germans left his lands. They are a race of Franks, among the most numerous and the most valiant. The Muslim capture of Jerusalem had distressed him, so he gathered his troops, provided for their every need and set out from his lands meaning to travel by Constantinople. The Byzantine emperor there sent to inform Saladin of this and to promise him that he would not allow him to cross his territory.

¹ This narrative adds drama to 'Imād al-Dīn's account (*Conquête*, 217–19), where he calls the man 'Alī, son of the master of the coppersmiths (*al-nahḥāsin*) in Damascus. How the hero of the hour was taken to Saladin is not explained. Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī met him (he calls him Ibn al-Nahḥās) at Aleppo in 603/1206–7 and heard the story directly from him (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, 402–3).

² i.e. Frederick I Barbarossa.

When, however, the German emperor came to Constantinople, its emperor was incapable of preventing him from passing through because of the great number of his followers, but he withheld provisions from them and did not allow any of his subjects to supply them with what they wanted. They ran short of supplies and provisions but travelled on until they traversed the Constantinople straits and found themselves on Muslim territory, the kingdom of Prince Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd ibn Sulaymān ibn Qutalmish ibn Saljuq. When they arrived at the beginning of his lands, the Ivaj Turkomans harassed them, continuing to shadow them, kill anyone who became isolated and steal what they could. It was wintertime and the cold in those lands can be intense and the snow deep. The cold, hunger and the Turkomans destroyed them and their numbers dwindled.

When they drew close to Konya, the Prince Quṭb al-Dīn Malikshāh ibn Qilij Arslān encountered them to bar their passage but he was not strong enough for them, so retired to Konya. In Konya was his father whom the aforementioned son had held under constraint. All his [other] sons had scattered through his lands and each one had made himself master of a region.

When Quṭb al-Dīn withdrew from the Franks, they made haste to pursue him and besieged Konya. They sent Qilij Arslān a present and said to him, ‘Your lands are not our objective and we have no wish for them. [49] Our only objective is Jerusalem.’ They asked him to allow his subjects to bring out the food and other things that they needed. He gave permission for this and, having received what they needed, their hunger was satisfied and, reprovisioned, they continued on their way. They later asked Quṭb al-Dīn to order his subjects not to trouble them and to hand to them several of his emirs as hostages. He feared them, so he gave them twenty or so emirs whom he disliked. They travelled with the Franks but thieves and others did not refrain from their attacks and their harassment of them, so the German emperor seized the emirs with him and put them in chains. Some perished in captivity and others ransomed themselves.

The German emperor continued until he came to the lands of the Armenians, ruled by Leon, son of Stephan, son of Leon, who supplied them with provisions and fodder. He recognized their authority and declared his obedience to them. They marched on towards Antioch. On their route was a river by which they camped. Their emperor entered it to wash himself and drowned at a spot where the water did not reach a man's waist. God saved us from his evil.

He had a son with him who succeeded as ruler.³ He proceeded toward Antioch. His followers were in dispute with him. Some wished to return home and abandoned him, while others inclined to make a brother of his emperor and they too went back. He continued with those who remained loyal to him, who were, when he reviewed them, 40,000 or so in number. Disease and death fell upon them and they reached Antioch, looking as though they had been exhumed from their graves. The lord of Antioch, inconvenienced by them, encouraged them to go to

³ His younger son, Frederick of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia.

join the Franks at Acre. They travelled by Jabala, Lattakia and other towns which the Muslims held and the people of Aleppo and elsewhere intercepted them and seized a great multitude of them. More died than were taken prisoner. They reached Tripoli, where they remained for a few days, but mortality was high among them and only about a thousand of them were left. They travelled by sea to the Franks at Acre [50] and when they arrived and they saw what they had suffered on their way and the disputes among them, they returned to their own lands. However, their ships foundered and not one of them survived.

Prince Qilij Arslān had been writing to Saladin with news of them and promising that he would stop them from crossing his lands. When they had crossed and left them behind, he sent apologies for being too weak for them because his sons ruled him and kept him under constraint, having variously abandoned him and cast off allegiance to him.

When news of the passage of the German emperor reached Saladin, he consulted his advisors. Many of them advised him to go to the route they would take and fight them before they could link up with those at Acre. Saladin answered, 'No, we shall remain until they approach us and then we shall act, so that our troops in Acre do not surrender.' However, he sent some of his troops, including the contingents from Aleppo, Jabala, Lattakia, Shayzar and elsewhere, to the district of Aleppo to be at the frontier to protect those regions from their hostile action. The state of the Muslims was as God (mighty and glorious is He) has said: 'When they came against you from above and from below, when eyes swivelled and hearts came into throats and you were thinking doubts about God, then were the Muslims tested and shaken with a severe shaking.'⁴

The following illustrates their great fear. One of Saladin's emirs possessed a village in the district of Mosul. My brother (God have mercy on him) administered it, the income of which came from wheat, barley and straw. He wrote to the emir about selling the crops but his letter came back, saying, 'Do not sell a single grain and acquire a lot of straw for us.' Then later a letter came from him, saying, 'You may sell the cereals. We do not need them.' The emir subsequently came to Mosul and we asked him why he prohibited the sale of the crop and then after a short time gave permission for it to be sold. He replied, 'When news of the arrival of the German emperor came, we were convinced that we would be unable to stay in Syria, so I wrote forbidding the sale of the crop so that it would be in store for us when we came to you. When God Almighty destroyed them and removed our need for the crop, I wrote ordering the sale and the realization of the profit.'

[51] Account of a battle between the Muslims and Franks at Acre

On 20 Jumādā II this year [25 July 1190] the Franks, horse and foot, came out from

⁴ Koran, xxxiii, 11–12.

behind their earthworks and advanced towards the Muslims in great numbers beyond counting. They moved against the Egyptian force, which was commanded by al-‘Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb. The Egyptians had already mounted up and formed their lines to meet the Franks. They clashed in fierce combat. The Egyptians gave ground before the Franks who entered their tents and plundered their belongings. The Egyptians then turned on them, fought them in the midst of their tents and forced them out. A detachment of the Egyptians set off toward the Franks' trenches and cut off their support from their comrades who had previously emerged. They had swarmed out like ants but when their support was intercepted, they despaired and were cut down from all sides. Only the odd fugitive escaped. There was great slaughter among them, the number of dead being more than ten thousand.

The troops of Mosul, commanded by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khurramshāh, son of ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd, lord of Mosul, were near the Egyptian force. They also charged the Franks and fought them as hard as they could, doing them much damage. All this was without any direct part in the action being taken by any of the special guard (*halqa*) which was with Saladin or by any of the left wing, where ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī, lord of Sinjār, and the contingent of Irbil and elsewhere were stationed.

After the Franks had suffered this disaster, their fire died down and their temper softened. The Muslims advised Saladin to take the initiative in the fight and conflict with them, while they were in this state of alarm and fear. It so happened that the next day he received a letter from Aleppo telling of the death of the German emperor and how his followers had suffered, perishing, being slain and taken prisoner, and how they had been reduced to small numbers and a wretched state. The Muslims were too preoccupied by this good news and their delight at it to engage those facing them and they expected that, when the Franks heard this news, they would add weakness [52] to their present weakness and fear to the fear they had. However, two days later the Franks received reinforcements by sea with a great count from overseas, called Count Henry, nephew of the king of France by his father and nephew of the king of England by his mother.⁵ A great amount of money beyond counting arrived with him. Having joined the Franks, he enlisted troops and bestowed money, so that their spirits rose again and became confident. He informed them that reinforcements were on their way in successive waves, so they held back and guarded their position. Later they showed that they were intending to emerge to meet the Muslims in battle. On 27 Jumādā II [1 August 1190] Saladin moved from his position to al-Kharrūba to have more room for manoeuvre. His camp had become polluted by the stink of the corpses.

⁵ Henry of Troyes, Count of Champagne, is intended but the royal connections are incorrectly explained. His mother was half-sister to both Richard I of England and Philip II of France, because of *her* mother Eleanor of Aquitaine's two royal marriages.

Count Henry erected a trebuchet, testudos and ballistas, but the Muslims in Acre made a sortie and seized them, killing many Franks who were by them. After the taking of his engines Count Henry wished to erect another trebuchet but was unable to do so because the Muslims in Acre were preventing him from constructing screens for the protection of those operating the trebuchet. He then built a mound of earth at a distance from the city and the Franks moved the mound by degrees toward the city, protecting themselves behind it and moving it ever closer.⁶ When it came to where the city was in range of a trebuchet missile, they set up two trebuchets behind the mound which now provided a screen for them.

Provisions had run short in Acre. Saladin sent to Alexandria ordering the dispatch of food, meats and such like by sea to Acre. The dispatch was delayed, so he sent to his lieutenant in Beirut asking about this. The latter sent a large transport vessel full of everything that they needed and ordered the crew to dress in the Frankish style. They disguised themselves accordingly and hoisted flags with crosses. When they arrived at Acre, there was no doubt [53] among the Franks that the vessel was theirs and they made no attempt to stop her. When she came opposite the harbour of Acre, the crew took her in. The Muslims were overjoyed and revived, their spirits raised. They were satisfied with what she contained until provisions arrived from Alexandria.

A queen of the Franks from beyond the seas set out with about 1,000 soldiers and was captured in the vicinity of Alexandria, as were the men with her. The Franks also received a letter from the pope, who is their leader whose commands they follow and whose word is like the word of prophets, not to be gainsaid. They hold that whoever is excommunicated by him is truly excluded and whoever he favours is truly favoured. He is the master of Rome. [The letter] ordered them to persevere in their undertaking, informing them that he had sent to all the Franks commanding them to travel to their aid by land and by sea and telling them that reinforcements were on their way, so they became stronger and more hopeful.

How the Franks emerged from their trenches

After waves of fresh men had joined the Franks and Count Henry enlisted a good number of them with the money that he had brought, they resolved to move out beyond their earthworks and engage the Muslims. They left men to besiege Acre and fight its defenders. They emerged on 11 Shawwāl [11 November 1190] as numerous as the grains of sand and as ardent as fire. When he saw this, Saladin moved the Muslims' heavy baggage to Qaymūn, three leagues distant from Acre. Those troops he had detached when the German emperor perished had already

⁶ This presumably refers to the zig-zag progress of a sap, the 'mound' being the spoil thrown up from the trench as it was dug. Cf. below p. [65].

returned, so he encountered the Franks in an excellent order of battle. In the centre were his sons, al-Afdal ‘Alī, al-Zāhir Ghāzī and al-Zāfir Khiḍr, while his brother al-‘Ādil Abū Bakr was on the right wing with the troops of Egypt and those combined with them. On the left wing were ‘Imād al-Dīn, lord of Sinjār, Taqī al-Dīn, lord of Hama, and Mu‘izz al-Dīn Sanjar Shāh, lord of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar, along with several emirs.

It happened [54] that Saladin was seized by colic, to which he was prone. He had a small tent erected for himself on a hill overlooking the army and camped there, observing them. The Franks proceeded east of the river there, until they came to the head of the river. They saw the armies of Islam in all their abundance and were apprehensive. The advance guard came into contact and showered them with arrows that all but hid the sun. Having seen this, they crossed to the west of the river, while the advance guard kept up a close quarters battle. The Franks had gathered together, holding close one to another. The aim of the advance guard was that the Franks should charge them, so that the Muslims could meet them, the battle be fully engaged and lead to a decision, allowing the men to rest. The Franks had come to regret leaving their trenches, so they held their position and passed that night.

On the following day they went back towards Acre to take refuge behind their earthworks, while the advance guard were at their backs, engaging them now with the sword, now with the spear and now with arrows. Whenever one of their number was killed, the Franks carried him away with them, so that the Muslims would not know their casualties. Had it not been for the pain that afflicted Saladin, this would have been the decisive moment. God has a plan which he will achieve! When the Franks regained their defensive works – and subsequently they did not venture out – the Muslims returned to their tents, having slain a great multitude of the Franks.

On 23 Shawwāl [23 November 1190] some Muslims lay in ambush, while another group skirmished with the Franks. Four hundred knights moved against them. The Muslims resisted a little and then gave way, followed by the Franks until they went past the ambush which then emerged. Not one of the Franks escaped.

The Franks suffered extreme famine, so that a *ghirāra*⁷ of wheat reached more than 100 Tyrian dinars, but they endured this. Muslims used to transport food to them from their own lands, for example Emir Usāma, governor of Beirut, who used to bring food and other things. Another one was Sayf al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad, known as al-Mashṭūb. He used to carry loads to them from Sidon [55], and it was the same from Ascalon and other places. Had it not been for this, they would have perished from hunger, especially in the winter when navigation was interrupted because of the rough state of the sea.

⁷ Literally ‘sack’. It was in weight (of wheat) a little over 200 kg or in volume 265 litres (Hinz, 37–8).

Account of the sending of replacement troops into Acre and the shortcomings that ended in its fall

With the onset of winter when the winds blew, the Franks feared for the ships they had because they were not in harbour, so they sent them to places they held, Tyre and the islands. Thus the way to Acre by sea was opened and the defenders sent to Saladin complaining of discontent, exhaustion and weariness. Emir Ḥusām al-Dīn Abū'l-Hayjā' the Fat was there as commander of the troops. Saladin ordered replacements to be organized and dispatched to Acre and the existing garrison to be brought out. He ordered his brother al-'Ādil to deal with this personally, so he moved to the seaside, camped beneath the heights of Haifa and assembled transports and galleys. As often as a group of troops came, he sent them off to Acre and brought out those they were replacing. Twenty emirs entered the city, where they had been sixty. Altogether those who went in were few in comparison with those who came out. Saladin's lieutenants were negligent about mustering and sending men. Some local Christians were in charge of his treasury. Whenever a group who had been enlisted came to them, they harassed them in a variety of ways, now by [the need to] establish identity and now by other demands, so that for this reason a vast number were dispersed. Added to this were Saladin's dilatoriness, his trust in his lieutenants and the fact that they were negligent. The winter came to an end, as did this operation. The Frankish ships returned to Acre and communication was interrupted except for a swimmer bringing a letter.

Among the emirs who entered Acre were Sayf al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Mashṭūb, 'Izz al-Dīn Arsul, the commander of the Asadiyya after Jāwulī and Jāwulī's son, and others. They entered Acre at the beginning of the year 587 [began 29 January 1191]. Some people had already advised [56] Saladin to send abundant monies, stores and much food to the garrison of Acre and order them to remain, for they were tried and experienced and their minds had accepted the situation they were in, but he did not do so. He thought that they were discontented and weary and that that would lead them to function badly and fail. The situation was quite the opposite.

Account of the death of Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf, lord of Irbil, and how his brother Muẓaffar al-Dīn went there

Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Zayn al-Dīn 'Alī, lord of Irbil, had come to Saladin with his troops. However, he fell ill and died on 18 Ramaḍān⁸ [19 October 1190]. 'Imād al-Dīn the Secretary reported in his book *The Syrian Lightning* as follows:⁹

⁸ The correct date is probably Tuesday 28 Ramaḍān/= 30 October. See *Fath*, 298; *Rawdatayn*, iv, 168.

⁹ Cf. the version quoted in *Rawdatayn*, iv, 168–9. A differently worded version, perhaps more critical, is in *Fath*, 298 (*Conquête*, 261).

We came to Mużaffar al-Dīn to console him for the loss of his brother. We expected that he would be sad, as he had no other brother and no son to occupy his thoughts. We found him too busy to grieve, occupied with securing what had been left behind and sitting in his dead brother's tent, having already arrested and imprisoned several of his emirs. He had acted quickly against them, not unmindful of them, including Buldājī, the lord of the castle of Khuftidhkān.¹⁰

He sent to Saladin requesting Irbil, prepared to give up Harrān and Edessa. Saladin granted him it as a fief and added to it Shahrazūr, its districts and Darband of Qarābulī and the Banu Qifjāq. When Zayn al-Dīn died, those in Irbil wrote to Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz because of their love for him and his good government among them and invited him to come so that they could make him ruler but neither he nor his lord, the Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn Mawdūd, dared [57] do that for fear of Saladin.

The main reason for their failure to act [is explained by the following]. 'Izz al-Dīn had arrested Mujāhid al-Dīn and Zayn al-Dīn ['Alī] took control of Irbil. Later 'Izz al-Dīn released Mujāhid al-Dīn from arrest and appointed him as his deputy. We have already mentioned all this. When he appointed him as his deputy, he did not give him full powers. He put alongside him a man who was one of Mujāhid al-Dīn's mamlukes who shared authority with him and countermanded whatever steps he took. Mujāhid al-Dīn was extremely angry at this, so when he was invited to Irbil, he said to someone he trusted, 'I will not comply, lest so-and-so gets authority there and limits my field of activity.' Thus Mużaffar al-Dīn came and became ruler there. He remained an obstacle in the throat of the Atabeg house which they were unable to swallow. We shall relate what action he took concerning them at various occasions, God willing.

Account of the Franks' taking of the city of Silves and its restoration to the Muslims

This year the son of Henriques, one of the kings of the Franks, took Silves in the west of Andalusia, one of the greatest Muslim cities there, and established his control over it.¹¹ News of this came to Emir Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Abd

¹⁰ According to Yāqūt, ii, 456, this is the correct name for two castles in the district of Irbil, which are sometimes called Khuftiyān and are distinguished as Khuftiyān al-Zarzārī (on the road to Marāgha) and Khuftiyān of Surkhāb ibn Badr (on the road to Shahrazūr).

¹¹ The town of Silves in the Algarve (Arabic: Shilb) was taken by the Portuguese with the help of passing crusaders in 585/1189. See *EI*(2), ix, 441. Sancho I, the ruler of Portugal (1185-1211), was the son of Alfonso I Henriques (1128-85). See O'Callaghan, *Medieval Spain*, 221-2 and 242-3.

al-Mu'min, the ruler of the Maghrib and Andalusia, so he equipped many troops and set out for Andalusia. He crossed the straits, sending a large body of his army by sea. He camped before the city and put it under siege, attacking the defenders fiercely. They were overcome and sued for terms, which he granted, and they surrendered the city¹² and retired to their own territory.

He then dispatched a force of Almohads, accompanied by a host of Arabs, into Frankish territory. They conquered [58] four cities that the Franks had taken forty years ago and did much slaughter among them. The Frankish ruler of Toledo¹³ was fearful and sent asking for peace. Abū Yūsuf made peace with him for five years and returned to Marrakech. A group of Franks refused to accept this treaty of which they disapproved but they were unable to show open dissent. They continued to watch for their opportunity until the beginning of the year 590 [began 27 December 1193] and then they made their move. We shall narrate their story there, God willing.

Account of the battle between Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Sultān Shāh in Khurasan

Sultān Shāh, the brother of Khwārazm Shāh, had caused trouble in the lands of Ghiyāth al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn, the two Ghurid rulers, in Khurasan. Ghiyāth al-Dīn made his preparations and marched from Fīrūzkūh to Khurasan in the year 585 [1189–90]. He continued to go back and forth in al-Tāliqān,¹⁴ Panjdeh,¹⁵ Marv and elsewhere, seeking a battle with Sultān Shāh, and he kept this up until the beginning of 586 [began 8 February 1190]. Sultān Shāh then assembled his troops and moved towards Ghiyāth al-Dīn. They met in a pitched battle and Sultān Shāh was defeated. Ghiyāth al-Dīn took some of his land and returned to Ghazna.¹⁶

Miscellaneous events

In Rabī' I of this year [8 April–7 May 1190] the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh took over Ḥadīthat 'Āna. He had sent an army there which besieged it in the year 585 [1189–90] and attacked [59] it fiercely. The siege lasted a long time and very many were slain on both sides. When food became short, they surrendered the town in return for specified fiefs. Its ruler and men came to Baghdad and were given fiefs.

¹² In Jumādā II 587/June 1191 (*EI*(2), ix, 441).

¹³ Alfonso VIII of Castile (1158–1214).

¹⁴ A town in Khorasan (Tukharistan) between Marv al-Rūdh and Balkh (Yāqūt, iii, 491; Krawulsky, 118).

¹⁵ Farsi for 'five villages', which by the thirteenth century had coalesced into one settlement in the district of Marv al-Rūdh (Yāqūt, i, 743; Krawulsky, 62).

¹⁶ For these events, see *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, 378–9, and for a discussion of the disputed chronology, 456, note 2.

Later they dispersed throughout the land and their need became great, so much so that I saw one of them reduced to begging and others became servants. We take refuge in God from the loss of His favour and the change of His goodwill.

This year Mas‘ūd ibn al-Nādir, the brass founder, died at Baghdad.¹⁷ He studied much Ḥadīth, was an excellent calligrapher, good and reliable.

There also died Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī at Mosul, where he was cadi. Before that he had been cadi in Aleppo and all its districts. He was a leading figure, generous and of much virtue, always having recourse to religion and good morals.

¹⁷ Abū'l-Faḍl Mas‘ūd ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Nādir (*sic*) was born in 515/1121-2 and died in Muḥarram/February 1190 (Sibṭ ibn al-Jawī, 406).

Account of ‘Izz al-Dīn the lord of Mosul’s siege of Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar]

During Rabī‘ I this year [29 March–27 April 1191] the Atabeg ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn Mawdūd ibn Zankī, lord of Mosul, marched to Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar and put it under siege. Its ruler, Sanjar Shāh ibn Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Mawdūd, the nephew of ‘Izz al-Dīn, was there.

The reason for the siege was that Sanjar Shāh had caused a lot of trouble for his uncle ‘Izz al-Dīn, spoke against him abominably and wrote to Saladin about him, now saying, ‘He means to attack your lands’, and at another time, ‘He corresponds with your enemies and encourages them to attack you’ and other such damaging matters. Meanwhile, ‘Izz al-Dīn was tolerating this reprehensible behaviour for various reason, partly because of their kinship and partly for fear that he might surrender [Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar] to Saladin.

During the previous year its ruler had gone to Saladin, when he was at Acre, among those several provincial rulers who had done so. He only remained for a little and then asked for leave to return to his lands. Saladin said to him, ‘We have with us several rulers of outlying areas, including ‘Imād al-Dīn, lord of Sinjār and elsewhere, who is older than you, and including your uncle ‘Izz al-Dīn’s son,¹ who is younger than you, and others too. If you open this door, others will follow your lead.’ Sanjar Shāh paid no attention to his words but persisted. With Saladin were a number of inhabitants of Jazīrat Ibn ‘Umar who were seeking support against [61] Sanjar Shāh because he was a tyrant and took their money and property. He was wary of Saladin for this reason.

He continued his requests for permission to return home until the eve of the end of the Ramaḍān fast in the year 586 [31 October 1190]. That night just before daybreak he rode to Saladin’s tent. He had given his men leave to depart and they had left with their baggage train. He himself remained with minimal equipment. When he came to Saladin’s tent, he sent requesting permission to attend on him, but Saladin had spent the night in a fever and had sweated much. It was not possible to receive him. He waited undecidedly at the door of the tent until he was allowed in. When he came into his presence, he greeted him on the Feast and prostrated himself to say farewell. Saladin said, ‘We did not know you genuinely intended to depart. Be patient with us until we send you what is customary. You are not allowed to leave in this manner after your stay with us.’ However, he did not back down, but made his farewells and departed.

Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar, Saladin’s nephew, had set out from his town of Hama with

¹ This was ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khurramshāh ibn ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd, see above p. [47]

his troops. Saladin wrote to him, ordering him to bring back Sanjar Shāh willy-nilly. The following account is given by Taqī al-Dīn:

I have never seen the like of Sanjar Shāh. I met him at the pass at Fīq and asked him why he was leaving. He tried to tell me a lie but I said to him, ‘I have heard of the circumstances. It is not fitting for you to depart without a mark of honour and a gift from the sultan. That would waste all your exertions.’ I asked him to return but he did not listen to what I said and addressed me as though I were one of his mamlukes. When I saw this, I said to him, ‘Either you return and put a brave face on it, or I shall take you back whether you like it or not.’ He dismounted and seized the hem of my garment and said, ‘I make you my protector’, and he began to weep. I was astonished first of all at his stupidity and secondly at his degradation. He then returned with me.

After his return he remained with Saladin for a number of days and Saladin wrote to ‘Izz al-Dīn the Atabeg, ordering him to go to Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] and besiege and take it, and that he should send [62] to intercept Sanjar Shāh to arrest him when he returned. ‘Izz al-Dīn feared that Saladin had prepared this as a plot to blacken his name as a breaker of the treaty. He therefore did none of that; rather, he sent to say, ‘I would like your written order for that and a diploma from you for Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar].’ Messengers went backwards and forwards until the end of the year 586. This present year arrived [began 29 January 1191] and an agreement was reached between them both. ‘Izz al-Dīn marched to Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] and besieged it for four months and a few days, ending in Sha‘bān [24 August–21 September 1191]. He did not take it over; on the contrary, he and Sanjar Shāh came to an understanding through the agency of Saladin’s envoy, for he had sent him after the attack on the town, saying, ‘The lord of Sinjār, the lord of Irbil and others have interceded for Sanjar Shāh.’ Peace was established on the basis that ‘Izz al-Dīn would have half the districts of Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] and Sanjar Shāh the other half and that Jazīrat [Ibn ‘Umar] should be held by Sanjar Shāh as part of his half.

In Sha‘bān [24 August–21 September 1191] ‘Izz al-Dīn returned to Mosul. Later Saladin used to say, ‘I never received a bad report about anyone without my finding him not as bad as was said, except for Sanjar Shāh, for things were repeated about him that I thought terrible but when I saw him, the reports were as nothing in my eyes [compared with the reality].’

Account of Taqī al-Dīn’s crossing the Euphrates and taking Harrān and other towns in the Jazīra, his expedition to Khilāt and his death²

In Ṣafar of this year [March 1191] Taqī al-Dīn went from Syria to the Jazīra lands,

² Reading *wa-mawtīhi*, as in *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xii, 40, not the edition’s *wa-Mu’ta* (!).

Ḩarrān and Edessa, which his uncle Saladin had given him as a fief, in addition to what he already held in Syria, after they were taken from Muẓaffar al-Dīn. He arranged with him that he would assign the lands to soldiers and return with them to be additional forces against the Franks. After he had crossed the Euphrates and settled the condition of his territories, [63] he went to Mayyāfāriqīn, which was his, and on arrival there, his ambition for other adjacent lands was renewed. He marched to Ḥānī in Diyār Bakr, besieged and took it, being at the head of 700 cavalry. When Sayf al-Dīn Baktimur, lord of Khilāṭ, heard that he had taken Ḥānī, he gathered his troops and moved against him. In all his troops numbered 4,000 cavalry. When they met in battle, the army of Khilāṭ did not stand firm before Taqī al-Dīn but fled. Taqī al-Dīn pursued them and entered their territory.

Baktimur had arrested Majd al-Dīn ibn Rashīq, the vizier of his lord Shāh Arman, and imprisoned him in a castle there. When he was defeated, he wrote to the governor of the castle, ordering him to execute Ibn Rashīq. His messenger arrived after Taqī al-Dīn had put the castle under siege. The latter took the letter, captured the castle and freed Ibn Rashīq, then went to Khilāṭ and besieged it. He did not have many troops and gained no success there, so he withdrew and attacked and besieged Malazgird. He established a tight blockade of the inhabitants and stayed there for a long time. When the situation became too difficult for them, they asked him for a truce for a number of days which they stipulated. He granted this to them.

However, Taqī al-Dīn fell ill two days before the period elapsed. His troops dispersed and his son and his companions bore him, now dead,³ to Mayyāfāriqīn. Baktimur returned and his position became strong and his rule firm after it had been on the point of extinction. These events illustrate 'Deliverance after Hardship', for Ibn Rashīq was saved from execution and Baktimur saved from captivity.

Account of the arrival at Acre of the Franks from the west by sea

This year Frankish reinforcements came by sea to the Franks besieging Acre. The first to arrive was King Philip, king of France, the noblest [64] of their kings in lineage, although his kingdom was not a great one. His arrival was on 12 Rabī‘ I [9 April 1191] but he was not leading the large numbers that they had hoped. He had with him only six large, impressive ships. Nevertheless, the spirits of those at Acre were raised and they persisted in their attacks on the Muslims within.

Saladin was at Shafar‘am and every day he was riding to engage the Franks to prevent them by his action from assaulting the city. He sent to Emir Usāma, the governor of Beirut, to order him to fit out the galleys and ships he had, to man them with fighting men and send them to sea to prevent the Franks landing at Acre.

³ Taqī al-Dīn died on Friday 19 Ramaḍān/= 11 October 1191 (*Fath*, 401).

He obeyed and sent the galleys to sea, where they encountered five ships full of men, the followers of the king of England, whom the latter had sent on before him. He himself tarried in Cyprus to effect its conquest. The Muslim galleys sailed against the Franks' ships. The Muslims won a victory and captured them, seizing the provisions, material and money they had and taking the men prisoner. Saladin also wrote to his neighbouring deputies, ordering them to take similar action, which they did.

The Franks at Acre persevered with their attacks and erected seven trebuchets on 4 Jumādā I [30 May 1191]. Seeing this, Saladin moved from Shafar'am and camped near the enemy to avoid the fatigue of the army in going to and fro every day. He became in close contact and whenever they moved to attack, he would mount up and engage them from beyond their earthworks. Thus they would be distracted by his attacks and the operations against the city defenders would be lighter.

The king of England arrived on 13 Jumādā I [8 June 1191]. On his way he had taken control of the island of Cyprus, which he took from the Byzantines. When he arrived there, he behaved treacherously to its ruler and seized all of it. This was an increase in his dominion and [added] strength for the Franks. When [65] he had finished there, he left to join the Franks at Acre. He arrived in twenty-five large ships, loaded with men and materials, greatly strengthening the Frankish threat. The damage they did to the Muslims increased greatly. The king was the outstanding man of his time for bravery, cunning, steadfastness and endurance. In him the Muslims were tried by an unparalleled disaster.

When news of his coming arrived, Saladin ordered the fitting out of a large ship (*būṭṣa*) full of men, equipment and provisions. It was prepared and sent out from Beirut, carrying 700 fighting men. The king of England met it by chance and engaged it. The Muslims on board fought steadfastly but when they despaired of escape, the captain, Ya'qūb al-Ḥalabī, commander of the Jandāriyya, who was known as the servant of Ibn Shaqtin, went below and made a large hole in the hull, to stop the Franks taking the ship's complement and the stores they had. Everything in it sank. Acre was in need of men because of the decrease in their numbers which we have mentioned.

The Franks then built siege towers and attacked with them but the Muslims burnt some and seized others. Next they made battering rams and attacked with them but the Muslims made a sortie, fought the Franks outside the city and seized those rams. When the Franks saw that none of this was any use to them, they made a large, elongated mound of earth and continued to move it closer to the city,⁴ fighting from behind it, so that they could not be hurt from the city. The mound was eventually half the height of the city [wall] and the Franks sheltered and fought behind it. The Muslims had no answer to it, not by fire or anything else. At that point disaster loomed large for the Muslim defenders of

⁴ See above p. [52].

Acre. They sent to Saladin to tell him the state of affairs but he could do nothing to help.

[66] Account of the Franks' capture of Acre

On Friday 17 Jumādā II [12 July 1191] the Franks (God curse them) conquered the city of Acre.

The first sign of weakness was that Emir Sayf al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Ahmad al-Hakkārī, known as al-Mashṭūb, who was there with several emirs, of whom he was the most distinguished and the senior, went out to the king of France and offered to surrender the city with its contents on condition that he would free the Muslims and allow them to join their sultan. The king refused that, so ‘Alī ibn Ahmad returned to the city. The defenders weakened, their spirits fell and they became disheartened and apprehensive.

Two emirs among those in Acre, when they saw how al-Mashṭūb was treated and that the Franks had not granted them terms, slipped away under cover of darkness,⁵ embarked on a small galley and secretly left their comrades and joined the army. They were ‘Izz al-Dīn Arsul al-Asadī and the son⁶ of ‘Izz al-Dīn Jāwulī and others were with them too. The next morning when this was discovered, people became more dispirited and weaker than ever and felt sure they were doomed.

The Franks then sent to Saladin to discuss the city's surrender. He agreed and proposed that he should free as many of his Frankish prisoners as there were men in the city, so that the Franks themselves could then let the Acre garrison go, and also that he would deliver them the Holy Cross. They, however, were not satisfied with this offer. Therefore Saladin sent to the Muslim defenders ordering them to break out of Acre as one man, follow the sea[shore] and all together fall upon the enemy, having abandoned the town and its contents. He promised them that he would advance with his troops towards the sector from which they would emerge and engage the enemy there to form a junction. They embarked on this operation but each man was preoccupied with bringing along what he owned and they were not free of their personal business until the break of day. Thus the plan was now useless as it was clearly revealed.

[67] The next morning they were incapable of holding the city. The Franks

⁵ For this expression (*ittakhadhū laylan jamalan*) see al- Maydānī, *Amthāl al-‘arab*, i, 230: ‘virum noctis tempore res gessisse significat’. Lane, *Lexicon*, s.v. *jamal*, glosses, not very appositely, ‘He journeyed all the night’.

⁶ He was Ḥusām al-Dīn Timurtāsh. Saladin deprived all who fled of their fiefs and, although they escaped other punishment, they lived on in disgrace. A certain Jamāl al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī, captain of Saladin's bodyguard (*jāndāriyya*) redeemed himself by returning the next night. He became a captive and was ransomed a year later by Saladin (*Conquête*, 313–14).

attacked with might and main. The defenders stood in clear view on the wall, waving their flags so that the Muslims could see, for that was a sign when they were hard-pressed. Seeing this, the Muslims broke out in weeping and wailing and charged the Franks all along the line, thinking that the Franks would be diverted from [their attack on] those in Acre. Saladin was urging them on, he himself being in the van. The Franks had moved out of their trenches and gravitated towards the city. The Muslims drew near their trenches and were almost entering them and putting the enemy to the sword when a cry was raised and the Franks returned and kept the Muslims out, having left some men facing the city's garrison to engage them.

When al-Mashṭūb saw that Saladin could do nothing for them nor save them from harm, he went out to the Franks and arranged with them to surrender the city and for the defenders to leave with their property and their lives. In return for that he offered them 200,000 dinars, fifty prisoners of note, the return of the Holy Cross and 14,000 dinars for the Marquis, lord of Tyre. They agreed to this, swearing an oath on it to him, and also that the period for providing the money and prisoners should extend to two months.

After they had sworn, he surrendered the city to them and they entered peacefully. However, having taken control, they acted treacherously and seized the Muslims within and their goods. They imprisoned them and maintained that they were doing this to ensure that they received what they had been offered. They contacted Saladin about sending the money, prisoners and the Holy Cross, so that they would release those they held. He started to gather the money, [68] although he did not have [ready] money; he used to spend money as it came in from his lands item by item.

After he had collected 100,000 dinars of the money, he assembled the emirs to consult them. They advised him not to send anything until he had again got them to swear to release his men and that the Templars should guarantee this because they were people of religion who hold with keeping faith. Saladin wrote to them about this and the Templars replied, 'We shall not swear nor give any guarantee, because we fear our side's treachery.' Their princes said, 'If you hand us the money [you have], the prisoners and the Holy Cross, we can choose [whom to free] among those we hold.' At that moment Saladin realized that they intended treachery, so sent them nothing. He sent back the envoy, saying, 'We shall give you this money, the prisoners and the Cross and give you hostages for what is outstanding and you can free our men. The Templars can guarantee the hostages and swear to keep faith with them.' They replied, 'We will not swear. You just send us the 100,000 dinars you have collected, the prisoners and the Cross and we will free those of your men that we wish and leave those we choose until the rest of the money comes.' People understood then that they meant treachery, that they would only release the army pages, the poor, the Kurds and those of no account, while detaining the emirs and the wealthy to demand ransoms from them. The sultan did not accept this.

On Tuesday 27 Rajab [20 August 1191] the Franks mounted up and came outside the city with horse and foot. The Muslims rode out to meet them, charged them and drove them from their position. Most of the Muslims they had been holding were found slain. They had put them to the sword and massacred them but preserved the emirs and captains and those with money. All the others, the general multitude, the rank and file and those with no money they slew. When Saladin saw this, he cancelled any obligation concerning the money he had collected and returned the prisoners and the Cross to Damascus.

[69] Account of the Franks' departure to Ascalon and its demolition

When the Franks (God curse them) had completed their settling of affairs at Acre, they moved out on 28 Rajab [21 August 1191] and set out on 1 Sha'bān [24 August] towards Haifa following the coast, not diverging at all. When Saladin heard of their departure, he announced that the army should also move which they did. On that day the advance guard was commanded by al-Afḍal, Saladin's son, along with Sayf al-Dīn Iyāzkūsh, 'Izz al-Dīn Jūrdīk and several valiant emirs. They harassed the Franks on their march and loosed arrows at them which wellnigh veiled the sun. They fell on the Frankish rearguard, killed several and captured several others.

Al-Afdal sent to his father, asking for reinforcements and keeping him informed. The sultan ordered the main troops to join him but they made excuses, claiming that they had not ridden ready equipped for battle but had only planned for a march, nothing more. So reinforcing came to nothing and the king of England retired to the Frankish rearguard, which he protected and rallied. They marched on until they came to Haifa, where they made camp. The Muslims camped at Qaymūn, a village nearby. The Franks summoned from Acre replacements for those killed or captured that day and replaced the horses that had perished.

Then they continued to Caesarea, while the Muslims shadowed them and snatched and killed those they could, because Saladin had sworn that everyone that fell into his hands should be killed in revenge for the men at Acre who had been put to death. When they drew close to Caesarea, the Muslims closed with them and engaged them fiercely, causing them many casualties. The Franks camped there and the Muslims spent the night nearby. After their stop, a party of Franks went some distance from their main body. The Muslims of the advance guard fell on them, [70] killing some and capturing others.

Next the Franks marched from Caesarea to Arsūf. The Muslims had preceded them there and had not been able to shadow them because of the narrowness of the route. When the Franks reached them, the Muslims made a formidable charge and forced them back to the sea. Some entered the water and many of them were killed. When the Franks saw this, they grouped together and the cavalry as one man charged the Muslims who turned their backs in flight with no thought for one

another. Many [auxiliary] cavalry and common people had been accustomed to take a position during a battle close to the action. On this particular day they had followed this practice and when the Muslims were routed, a great number of them were killed. The fugitives took refuge in the centre with Saladin. Had the Franks realized that it was a rout, they would have pursued, the rout would have continued and the Muslims would have been destroyed. However, close to the Muslims there was a grove of dense trees which the Muslims entered and the Franks suspected that it was a trick, so they withdrew and took the pressure off them. On the Frankish side a great count, one of their devilish tyrants, was slain and on the Muslim side a mamluke of Saladin, called Ayāz the Tall, a man noted for bravery and boldness, unique in his age. When the Franks made camp, the Muslims did so too, though keeping their horses' reins in their hands.

Next the Franks marched to Jaffa where they halted. There was no Muslim there, so they occupied it. After the defeat that the Muslims suffered at Arsūf, which we have mentioned, Saladin departed for Ramla and met up with the baggage train there. He assembled the emirs and consulted them about what to do. They advised the demolition of Ascalon and said, 'You have seen what happened to us recently. If the Franks come to Ascalon and we face them to hold the city against them, they no doubt [71] will fight us to force our withdrawal and then besiege the place. If that is the case, we shall be back to the same position we were in at Acre and things will be hard for us, because the enemy has grown powerful by taking Acre and the weapons and such like that it contained. We have been weakened by what we have lost and we have not had a long time to re-equip with new.'

Saladin could not countenance its demolition, so ordered men to enter there and act as garrison. However, nobody agreed to do this. They said, 'If you wish to hold the place, then come in with us yourself and one of your older sons. Otherwise none of us will enter lest we suffer what the men at Acre suffered.' When he saw that this was the case, he went to Ascalon and ordered its demolition. This was done on 19 Sha'bān [11 September 1191] and the masonry was thrown into the sea. An amount, beyond computing, of money and treasure belonging to the sultan and his subjects was lost on it. He erased all trace of it so that the Franks should have no desire to make it an objective. When the Franks heard of its demolition, they remained where they were and made no move in that direction.

The Marquis (God curse him), after the Franks took Acre, became apprehensive of treachery towards him from the king of England. He therefore fled to Tyre, which he held as his own. He was the Franks' leading man for good sense and bravery, he being the one who had kindled all these battles. When Ascalon was razed, he sent to the king of England, saying, 'A man like you is not fit to be a king and command armies. You hear that Saladin has destroyed Ascalon and you remain where you are? You fool, when you heard that he had started to raze it, you should have marched against him with all speed, forced him to leave and seized it with ease without a fight or a siege. He has only ruined it because he was unable to hold

it. By the truth of the Messiah, had I been with you, Ascalon would be in our hands today without the destruction of a single tower.'

[72] After the destruction of Ascalon, Saladin left on 2 Ramaḍān [23 September 1191] and went to Ramla, whose castle he demolished, as he did the church at Lydda. During his stay at Ascalon to demolish it, the armies were with al-Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb facing the Franks. After razing Ramla, Saladin went to Jerusalem. He reviewed [its defences] and the armaments and stores it contained. Having organized its affairs, supplies and whatever it needed, he returned to his camp on 8 Ramaḍān [29 September].

During these days the king of England left Jaffa along with a small body of Franks from their camp and fell in with some Muslims who fought them fiercely. The king of England was almost taken prisoner. One of his comrades sacrificed himself; the king escaped but this man was taken.

There was also another battle between a group of Muslims and a group of Franks, in which the Muslims were victorious.

Account of the Franks' move to Latrun

When Saladin saw that the Franks clung to Jaffa and did not leave but embarked on fortifying it, he moved his position to Latrun on 13 Ramaḍān [4 October 1191] and made camp there. The king of England sent to him, seeking peace. A series of envoys came to al-Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb, Saladin's brother, and it was settled that the king should marry his sister to al-Ādil, that Jerusalem and the coastal lands that the Muslims held should be al-Ādil's and Acre and what was in Frankish hands should be for the king's sister, in addition to a kingdom she already had over the sea, which she had inherited from her husband, and that the Templars would accept whatever was agreed upon. Al-Ādil submitted this to Saladin who agreed to it. When this became public knowledge, the priests, bishops and monks assembled before the king of England's sister [73] and expressed their disapproval, so she refused to comply. Some other obstacle was spoken of, but God knows best!⁷

After this al-Ādil and the king of England used to meet and engage in talk of peace. The king asked al-Ādil to let him hear some Muslim music, so he summoned a female singer, who played the harp. She sang and he found it admirable. However, no peace was concluded between them. The king was doing this as a skilful strategem.

The Franks revealed their plan of marching on Jerusalem. Saladin went to Ramla with a light reconnaissance force, leaving the baggage train at Latrun. He came close to the Franks and stayed for twenty days observing them. They did not

⁷ Joanna, Richard I's sister, was the widow of William of Sicily. For this proposal and other negotiations, see Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 342–3.

move. During his stay there were several engagements between the two sides, in all of which the Muslims were victorious over the Franks. Saladin then returned to Latrun and on 3 Dhū'l-Qa'da [22 November 1191] the Franks moved from Jaffa to Ramla with the intention of attacking Jerusalem. Both sides drew close to one another. The situation was critical and extreme caution was exercised. At every hour the call to arms would sound in both armies. They experienced great hardship from this, but winter approached and the mud and the rains kept them both apart.

Account of Saladin's move to Jerusalem

Seeing the onset of winter with continuous, unbroken rains and the distress and hardship caused to his men thereby and by the severe cold, the wearing of armour and the sleepless nights in constant toil - and many of his troops had been on campaign for a long time - he allowed them to return to their homelands to rest and recuperate. He himself went to Jerusalem with those who remained [74] with him and all lodged within the city, where they rested from their recent operations. Saladin lodged in the clergy residence,⁸ near the church of the Sepulchre. A force from Egypt arrived, commanded by Emir Abū'l-Hayjā' the Fat and the morale of the Muslims in Jerusalem was raised.

The Franks came from Ramla to Latrun on 3 Dhū'l-Ḥijja [22 December 1191] with the intention of marching to Jerusalem. There were some battles between them and the Muslim screening force, in one of which the Muslims captured fifty or so of the Franks' famous and brave knights. After his entry into Jerusalem, Saladin had ordered the repair of the city wall and the renewal of what was damaged. He strengthened most carefully the place where the city had been forcibly entered and ordered the digging of a ditch beyond the outworks. Every tower he assigned to an emir to supervise the work on it. His son al-Afḍal worked from the area of the Gate of Columns to the Gate of Mercy.⁹ The Atabeg 'Izz al-Dīn Mas'ūd, lord of Mosul, sent a group of quarrymen,¹⁰ men who had great expertise in cutting rock. They built a tower and a stretch of curtain wall for him there. All the emirs did similar things. When the supply of stone for the builders dwindled, Saladin (God have mercy on him) rode out and personally brought stone

⁸ In Arabic *dār al-aqissā'*. Probably the Patriarch's residence is intended, which Saladin later endowed as a Sufi centre (*khānqāh*). See *Fath*, 442: 'he had endowed the Patriarch's residence near the church of the Sepulchre as a *ribāṭ* for them'.

⁹ *Fath*, 401, mentions the repair of towers from the Gate of Columns (present Damascus Gate) to 'the Miḥrāb Gate' (*sic*).

¹⁰ In Arabic *jaṣṣāṣīn*, literally 'gypsum workers', translated in *Conquête*, 367, as 'terrassiers' (navvies). *Fath*, 400, calls these (50) men *hajjārīn* (masons). *Rawdatayn*, iv, 289 is unspecific: '50 men to cut rock from the ditch.'

on his horse from distant places. The army followed his example. In a single day enough was assembled for the builders to keep them busy for several days.¹¹

Account of the Franks' withdrawal from Ramla

On 20 Dhū'l-Hijja [8 January 1192] the Franks returned to Ramla. The reason for this was that they were bringing what they wanted from the coast and once they were a long way from it, the Muslims were attacking those that transported their supplies, preventing their passage and seizing what they had. Then [75] the king of England said to the Syrian Franks with him, 'Picture'¹² the city of Jerusalem for me, as I have not seen it.' They did so and he saw the valley surrounding it, except on one side, which was approachable from the north. He asked about the valley and its depth and was told that it was deep and difficult of access. He went on, 'This city cannot be besieged as long as Saladin lives and the Muslims are united, because if we take our position on the side adjacent to the city the other sides will remain unblockaded and men, supplies and whatever they need will get in. If we split up and some of us camp on the valley side and some on the other, Saladin will gather his army and fall upon one of the two groups and the other will not be able to aid their comrades, because, if they leave their position the defenders in the city will come forth and seize their belongings and because, if they leave men there to guard it and go to their comrades, before they can get clear of the valley and rejoin them, Saladin will have dealt with them. This is apart from the impossibility of getting the fodder and provisions that we need.' When he said this to them, they realized that he was right. They saw how short their supplies were and what the men transporting them were suffering from the Muslims, so they advised the king to return to Ramla. They did so, disappointed and frustrated.

Account of the killing of Qizil Arslān

In Sha'bān of this year [24 August–21 September 1191] Qizil Arslān was killed. His personal name was 'Uthmān ibn İldikiz and we have already mentioned that after the death of his brother Pahlawān he became ruler of Arran, Azerbaijan, [76] Hamadhan, Isfahan, Rayy and their regions. The lord of Fars and Khuzistan obeyed him and he controlled Sultan Tughril ibn Arslān ibn Tughril, whom he confined in a castle. The whole country was subject to him.

¹¹ The differing versions of this sentence in *Kāmil* and *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xii, 48, are both unsatisfactory. The present (free) translation follows the text in *Recueil*, ii, 55. The comment follows on the previous reference to short supply.

¹² The verb is *ṣawwar*. Does it and the following verb 'saw' imply a mental picture or some form of material representation, even as in Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*, 345: 'he asked for a plan of the city'?

At the end of his life he went to Isfahan, where civil discords had been continuous from the moment of Pahlawān's death until this present time. He showed strong antipathy to the Shāfi'iś and arrested several of their leading men and crucified them. He returned to Hamadhan where he had the khutbah proclaimed in his name and the five-fold ceremonial drums beaten at his gate. Later, the night he was killed, he entered his quarters to sleep and his men dispersed. Someone then came in and killed him in his bed. It was not known who had killed him. His men seized his chamberlain on suspicion and guesswork. He had been a worthy man of excellent character, who loved and preferred justice and looked to be forgiving and punish only seldom.¹³

Miscellaneous events

This year Mu'izz al-Dīn Qayṣar Shāh ibn Qılıj Arslān, ruler of Anatolia, came to Saladin in Ramadān [22 September-21 October 1191]. His coming came about in the following way. His father 'Izz al-Dīn Qılıj Arslān divided his kingdom among his sons. He gave this particular son Malaṭya and he gave Sivas to his son Quṭb al-Dīn Malikshāh, who dominated his father, deprived him of his freedom of action and removed his authority. He compelled him to take Malaṭya from his brother and give it to him. Mu'izz al-Dīn was fearful and went to Saladin to seek protection and support. Saladin received him generously and married him to the daughter of his brother al-'Ādil. Quṭb al-Dīn then refrained from hostility towards Mu'izz al-Dīn who returned to Malatya in Dhū'l-Qa'da [20 November-19 December 1191].

Someone I trust told me the following: 'I saw Saladin when he had ridden out to say farewell to this Mu'izz al-Dīn. The latter dismounted as did Saladin who said farewell on foot but when he went to mount Mu'izz al-Dīn supported him and helped him into his saddle. His garments were then arranged by 'Alā' [77] al-Dīn Khurramshāh, son of 'Izz al-Dīn lord of Mosul. I was astonished at this and said, "O son of Ayyūb, you should not worry how you might die, when a Saljuq prince and a descendant of Atabeg Zankī help you to mount!"'

This year Ḥusām al-Dīn Muḥammad¹⁴ ibn 'Umar ibn Lājīn, a nephew of Saladin, died and also 'Alam al-Dīn Sulaymān¹⁵ ibn Jandar, another of the great emirs of Saladin.

In Rajab [August 1191] there died Ṣafī al-Dīn ibn al-Qābiḍ, who was the administrator of Damascus for Saladin and had authority in all his lands.¹⁶

¹³ To supplement this section, see *Conquête*, 362-5.

¹⁴ He died the eve of Friday 19 Ramadān/= 11 October 1191. See *Conquête*, 361, where the date has been wrongly converted.

¹⁵ He became ill and died at Ghabāghib near Damascus on his way home to Aleppo. News of his death arrived at Jerusalem on Thursday 28 Dhū'l-Hijja/16 January 1192 (*Fath*, 407).

¹⁶ He died 23 Rajab/16 August. Cf. the summary of his career in *Conquête*, 365 (date incorrectly converted).

Account of the Franks' reconstruction of Ascalon

In Muḥarram this year [18 January-16 February 1192] the Franks went to Ascalon and embarked on its reconstruction. Saladin was in Jerusalem and the king of England left Ascalon with a lightly-equipped force to meet the Muslim screening force. An engagement followed in which both sides fought fiercely and honours were even.

During Saladin's stay at Jerusalem his squadrons continued to harass the Franks, now confronting a group of them and now cutting off their supplies. One of these squadrons was a squadron commanded by Fāris al-Dīn Maymūn al-Qaṣrī, one of the officers of Saladin's mamlukes, He intercepted a large Frankish caravan, seized it and plundered what it was carrying.

Account of the killing of the Marquis and Count Henry's accession to the throne

On 13 Rabī‘ II [28 April 1192] the Marquis (God curse him), lord of Tyre, one of the greatest of the Frankish devils, was killed.

This came about as follows. Saladin made contact with the head of the Ismā‘īlīs in Syria, namely Sinān, and encouraged him to send someone to kill the king of England. If he killed the Marquis, he would have ten [79] thousand dinars. They were unable to assassinate the king and Sinān did not see any advantage for them in it, [being eager] that Saladin should not have a mind untroubled by the Franks and thus be free to deal with them. He was greedy to get money, so he inclined toward killing the Marquis. He sent two men disguised as monks, who became associated with the lord of Sidon and Balian's son the lord of Ramla. They were both with the Marquis in Tyre. The two stayed with them for six months, making a show of piety. The Marquis became acquainted with them and trusted them. On the above date¹ the bishop at Tyre gave a banquet for the Marquis. He attended, ate his food and drank his wine and left. The two Bāṭinīs we have mentioned leapt on him and wounded him severely. One of them fled and entered a church to hide. It chanced that the Marquis was carried there to have his wounds bound. This assassin attacked and slew him. Both Bāṭinīs were killed in due course.²

¹ The edition and *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xii, 51, read *fa-lamā kāna ba‘d al-ta’rīkh*, literally ‘when it was after the date’. Follow *Recueil*, ii, 58, which has *hādhā al-ta’rīkh*, literally ‘when it was this date’.

² Cf. the account in Nicholson, *Chronicle*, 305-7.

The Franks attributed his assassination to the king of England's instigation, for he wished to become the sole ruler of the Syrian littoral.³ After the Marquis' death, he was succeeded in Tyre by a Frankish count from over the seas, called Count Henry. That very night he married the queen and consummated the marriage, although she was pregnant.⁴ In their view pregnancy is not an impediment to marriage.

This Count Henry was the nephew of the king of France on his father's side and the nephew of the king of England on his mother's side. He became king of the Frankish lands on the coast after the king of England returned home and lived until the year 594 [1197], when he fell from a roof and died.⁵ He was intelligent, very sociable and long-suffering. After the king of England had departed, Count Henry sent to Saladin to win his sympathy and his regard and to ask him for a robe of honour. He said, 'You know that wearing a robe (*qabā'*) and a tall bonnet (*sharbūsh*) we hold to be shameful, but I shall wear them from you out of love for you.' Saladin sent him a splendid outfit, including a robe and a bonnet which Henry wore at Acre.

[80] Account of the sack of Basra by the Banū 'Āmir

In Ṣafar [February 1192] the Banū 'Āmir gathered in a great host with their emir, named 'Umayra, and attacked Basra. The emir there, whose name was Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, acted as deputy for the fief-holder, Emir Tughril, a mamluke of the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh. The Arabs arrived on Saturday 6 Ṣafar [22 February 1192] and Emir Muḥammad went out to meet them with the troops he had. A battle was fought between them at Hippodrome Road (*Darb al-Maydān*) next to al-Khurayba⁶ and it lasted until the end of the day. After nightfall the Arabs opened several breaches in the wall and the following day they entered the city. The inhabitants resisted and many were killed on both sides. The Arabs plundered the taverns on the river bank and some of the quarters of Basra. The population crossed to the Sailors' Bank, but that same day the Arabs left the town and the people came back.

The reason why the Arabs left quickly was that they heard of the approach of

³ 'Imād al-Dīn makes Richard I unequivocably responsible for the assassination (see *Fath*, 420ff). This is denied in Nicholson, *Chronicle*, 307-8.

⁴ In fact Henry married Isabella, the daughter of King Amalric I, within a week and they both entered Acre on 5 May 1192. She was carrying her second husband Conrad's daughter Maria. (Runciman, iii, 65-66).

⁵ His royal connections through his mother and his grandmother, Eleanor of Aquitaine, are correctly explained in a note above, p. [52]. Henry died after an accidental fall from a window of his palace on 10 September 1197 (Runciman, iii, 93).

⁶ According to Yāqūt, ii, 429, this was 'a place' at Basra, a former ruined area that had been redeveloped, hence the literal meaning 'the little waste'.

the Khafāja and al-Muntafiq. They went to meet them and fought a very fierce battle in which the ‘Āmir were victorious and plundered the possessions of Khafāja and al-Muntafiq. They returned to Basra on Monday morning [24 February]. The emir had assembled a large body of men from the inhabitants of Basra and the countryside. When the ‘Āmir returned, the population and those who had rallied to them gave battle but could not stand against the Arabs and were defeated. The Arabs entered Basra and sacked it again. The inhabitants left the city, having had their belongings plundered. Dreadful things were done. For two days Qasāmil⁷ and other places were sacked. Eventually the Arabs went away and the population returned.

I have seen exactly this same narrative for the year 593 [1196-7] and God knows best!

[81] Account of what the king of England did

On 9 Jumādā I [23 May 1192] the Franks seized the castle of Dārūm and demolished it. Then they marched towards Jerusalem, where Saladin was, and they reached Bayt Nūbā. The reason for their ambitious move was that Saladin had dispersed his eastern and other troops because of the winter, to rest them and summon replacements. Some of them went with his son al-Afdal and his brother al-‘Ādil to Mesopotamian lands for the reason that we shall mention, God willing. Some of the Egyptian troops, his special guard, remained. Therefore the Franks thought that they would gain some success. When Saladin heard of their approach, he assigned the city's towers to various emirs.

At the end of the month [13 June] the Franks moved from Bayt Nūbā to Qalūnaya, which is two leagues from Jerusalem. The Muslims heaped troubles upon them and sent a succession of squadrons at whose hands the Franks suffered more than they could stand. They realized that, if they besieged Jerusalem, evils would more swiftly come upon them and they would be more surely overwhelmed, so they turned on their heels and withdrew, while the Muslims pursued them with spears and arrows.

When the Franks were far from Jaffa, Saladin sent a squadron from his army there. They came near and prepared an ambush there. A body of Frankish knights passed by with a caravan. The ambush was sprung and they killed, captured and plundered some of them. This was at the end of Jumādā I [13 June].⁸

⁷ Qasāmil was the name of a clan of Azd, who had a quarter in Basra to which they gave their name. It was situated between the bulk of the town and the Tigris bank (*Yāqūt*, iv, 93).

⁸ According to *Fath*, 424, this ambush was on Tuesday 3 Jumādā II/16 June 1192. Cf. Nicholson, *Chronicle*, 331-3, according to which the caravan left Jaffa on Wednesday 17 June.

[82] Account of the Franks' overcoming a Muslim force and a caravan

On 9 Jumādā II [22 June 1192] the Franks received intelligence that a force was coming from Egypt, accompanying a large caravan. The commander of the force was Falak al-Dīn Sulaymān, a brother of al-Ādil on his mother's side, and several emirs were with him. The Franks travelled by night and fell upon them in the region of Hebron. Our soldiers fled. Not a single man of note was killed but only some pages and rank and file. Their tents and equipment were seized by the Franks. As for the caravan, part was taken and those that escaped went up into the Hebron hills. The Franks did not risk pursuit. Had they done so for half a league, they would have annihilated them. The survivors from the caravan were dispersed and scattered, meeting with hardship until they re-grouped.⁹

One of our associates, with whom we had sent something to Egypt for trading and who had travelled back in this caravan, told me the following:

When the Franks descended on us, we had just roused our pack animals to depart. They charged and fell upon us. I beat my beasts and climbed the hill along with several pack animals belonging to someone else. A group of Franks caught us up and took the animals that were following me. I was a bowshot's distance in front of them and they did not reach me, so I escaped with what I had. I travelled on, not knowing where I was going. Suddenly large buildings on a hill came into my view. I asked what they were and was told, 'That is Kerak'. I reached it and from there returned safely to Jerusalem.

This man left Jerusalem safe and sound and when he came to Buzā'a near Aleppo, was taken by robbers. He escaped from disaster but was lost when he thought all was secure.

Account of al-Afḍal and al-Ādil's expedition to Mesopotamia

We have already mentioned the death of Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar, Saladin's nephew, and his son Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad's taking control of Mesopotamia. After he had done so, he sent to Saladin [83] for its formal assigning to him in addition to what his father had held in Syria. Saladin did not think that lands such as these should be handed to a young man, so refused the request. Because Saladin was occupied with the Franks, Muḥammad was tempted to disobey. Al-Afḍal 'Alī, Saladin's son, asked his father to grant him what had been Taqī al-Dīn's and [to allow him] to give up Damascus. Saladin agreed this and ordered him to go on his way. With a detachment of the army he set out for Aleppo. Saladin wrote to the rulers of the eastern lands, such as the lords of Mosul, Sinjār, Jazīrat [Ibn 'Umar], Diyār Bakr and elsewhere, commanding them to send troops to his son al-Afḍal.

⁹ See the account of this operation in Nicholson, *Chronicle*, 338-43.

Seeing this, Taqī al-Dīn's son realized that he had not the strength to meet them, so he made contact with al-Ādil, his great-uncle, asking him to improve his relations with Saladin. This was reported to Saladin who mended his relations with him and arranged a settlement, that he would assign him what his father had had in Syria, while Mesopotamia would be taken from him. Agreement was reached on this basis.

Saladin assigned the Mesopotamian lands, namely Ḥarrān, Edessa, Sumaysāt, Mayyāfāriqīn and Ḥānī, to al-Ādil and sent him to Taqī al-Dīn's son to take over these lands from him and to dispatch him to Saladin and to send back al-Afdal, wherever he caught up with him. Al-Ādil set out, caught up with al-Afdal at Aleppo and sent him back to his father. He himself crossed the Euphrates and took over the lands from Taqī al-Dīn's son and appointed deputies for himself there. Taking Taqī al-Dīn's son with him, he then returned to Saladin with his armies. His return took place in Jumādā II this year [July 1192].¹⁰

Account of the return of the Franks to Acre

After the return of al-Afdal with his following and the return of al-Ādil and Taqī al-Dīn's son with their troops, they were joined by the eastern armies, those of Mosul, [84] Diyār Bakr, Sinjār and elsewhere, and the troops gathered in Damascus. [At that] the Franks became convinced that they could not stand against them if they moved away from the sea. They therefore returned towards Acre, making plain their intention of attacking and besieging Beirut. Saladin ordered his son al-Afdal to go there with his and all the eastern troops to oppose the Franks on their march thither. He proceeded to Marj al-'Uyūn, where the forces gathered with him. He remained there, waiting for the Franks to move, but when they heard this, they stayed at Acre and did not leave it.

Account of Saladin's taking of Jaffa

When the Franks returned to Jaffa, the troops of Aleppo and others gathered with Saladin. He marched to Jaffa, which was held by the Franks. Having descended on it and engaged the garrison, he took it by assault on 20 Rajab¹¹ [= 31 July 1192]. The Muslims sacked the town and seized everything there. They killed the Franks and took many prisoners. Most of what had been taken from the Egyptian force and the caravan that had accompanied them – this incident has already been mentioned – was in Jaffa.

A detachment of Saladin's mamlukes positioned themselves at the city gates.

¹⁰ He returned 'at the end of Jumādā II' / ended 12 July (*Fath*, 428).

¹¹ *Fath*, 430, specifies that it was a Friday.

When any soldier came out carrying any item of plunder, they took it from him. If he resisted, they beat him and took what he had by force. The troops then assaulted the citadel and fought until the end of the day. They were close to taking it and then the defenders asked for terms to save their lives. Their Patriarch emerged with several Frankish nobles to discuss this. They shilly-shallied, for their purpose was to stop the Muslims' attack. Night fell on them and they promised the Muslims that they would come down and surrender the citadel early the following day.

In the morning Saladin demanded that they give up the citadel but they refused, for it appeared that relief had arrived from Acre. The king of England came to join them and drove out the Muslims who were in Jaffa. [85] Further reinforcements came to him from Acre and he went outside the city, confronted the Muslims alone and charged them but nobody responded to his challenge. He halted between the lines and called for food from the Muslims, then dismounted and ate. Saladin ordered his troops to charge them and to fight them with all their might. One of his emirs, known as al-Janāḥ, the brother of al-Mashṭūb ibn ‘Alī ibn Ahmad al-Hakkārī, came forward to him and said, ‘Saladin, your mamlukes who seized the booty yesterday and beat men with their maces, tell them to advance and fight. If there is fighting to be done, it's us, but if there is booty, it's theirs.’ Saladin became very angry at what he said and withdrew from the Franks. He was (God have mercy on him) mild and generous, very forgiving when he had the power [to punish]. He retired to his tent and remained until the troops had assembled. His son al-Afdal and his brother al-‘Ādil came to him with the eastern armies and he moved with them to Ramla to see what might befall between himself and the Franks. The Franks stayed close in Jaffa and did not leave.¹²

Account of the peace made with the Franks and Saladin's return to Damascus

On 20 Sha'bān this year a peace treaty was agreed between the Muslims and the Franks for a period of three years and eight months to begin from this date, which corresponded to 1 September [1192]. This peace came about because the king of England saw the gathering of our armies, that he was unable to move away from the coast, that the Muslims had no city on the coast that he could hope to take and that he had been away from his own lands for a long time. [86] He therefore made peace overtures to Saladin, declaring in this way the opposite of what he was originally declaring. Saladin did not respond to his request, thinking that it was done out of guile and deceit and he sent a demand for battles and war. The Frank sent his envoys time after time and gave up [his demand that] Ascalon's reconstruction should be completed and that Gaza, Dārūm and Ramla should be ceded. He sent to al-‘Ādil on the matter of settling this treaty and the latter and a

¹² Versions of these events at Jaffa may be found in Bahā' al-Dīn, 217-26 and Nicholson, *Chronicle*, 349-58.

number of emirs advised that peace be agreed, telling Saladin of the discontent and weariness felt by the army, whose arms and mounts had been lost and pay exhausted. They said, ‘This Frank has asked for peace only so that he can sail away and return home. If acceptance is delayed until the onset of winter and the interruption of navigation, we shall need to remain here another year and then the hardship will be great for the Muslims.’

They spoke much in that vein and then Saladin agreed to peace. The Frankish envoys came and concluded the treaty, to which all swore. Among those who attended on Saladin was Balian ibn Birzān, who was lord of Ramla and Nablus. When Saladin swore his oath, Balian said to him, ‘Know that nobody in Islam has done what you have done and never have the Franks lost as many as they have in this period. We have computed the number of fighting men that came by sea to join us and they were 600,000, of whom only one in ten has returned home. Some you killed, some died and others drowned.’

When the business of the treaty had been concluded, Saladin gave permission for the Franks to visit Jerusalem. They performed their pilgrimage and departed, every group returning to its own land. Count Henry remained on the Syrian coast as ruler over the Franks and the territory they held. He was of good character, little given to troublemaking and friendly and well-disposed to the Muslims. He married the queen who was ruler of the Frankish lands before Saladin conquered them, as we have mentioned.

As for Saladin, after the completion of the peace he went to Jerusalem and ordered [87] its city wall to be strengthened. He incorporated within the wall the church of Zion, which had been two bowshots’ distance outside. He created the madrasah, the hospice and hospital and other Muslim institutions and endowed them with charitable trusts.¹³ He kept the Ramadān fast in Jerusalem and planned to go on the Pilgrimage and assume his pilgrim’s state from there but that was not possible for him. He left the city to go to Damascus on 5 Shawwāl [14 October 1192], leaving as his deputy in Jerusalem an emir called Jūrdīk, one of Nūr al-Dīn’s mamlukes.

When he travelled, he took a route by the frontier towns of Islam, such as Nablus, Tiberias, Safed and Tibnīn. He also visited Beirut and familiarized himself with these areas and ordered their fortification. While in Beirut he was visited by Bohemond, ruler of Antioch and its dependencies, who, at their meeting, did obeisance. Saladin bestowed a robe of honour upon him before he returned to his lands. After his return, Saladin set out for Damascus, where he arrived on 25 Shawwāl [3 November]. The day he made his entry was a memorable one. The people rejoiced greatly to see him because his absence had been long and because of the enemy’s departure from Islamic territory.

¹³ The madrasah was the Shāfi‘ī al-Ṣalāhiyya (formerly St Anne’s Church), the Sufi hospice was established in the former Patriarch’s residence and the hospital was set up in a former church near the Holy Sepulchre (see Richards, ‘Saladin’s Hospital’).

Account of the death of Qilij Arslān

In the middle of Sha'bān this year [= 27 August 1192]¹⁴ there died in the city of Konya the Prince Qilij Arslān ibn Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān ibn Sulaymān ibn Qutlumish ibn Saljūq of the house of Saljūq. The lands he had held were Konya and its dependencies, Akseray, Sivas, Malatya and others. His reign had lasted about twenty-nine years. He was a man of excellent rule, great prestige and abundant justice and made many military expeditions into Byzantine lands. In his old age he divided his lands among his sons. They considered him weak and paid no attention to him. His son Quṭb al-Dīn restricted his movements.

[88] Qilij Arslān had appointed as his deputy to administer his kingdom a man known as Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Ḥasan, whom Quṭb al-Dīn executed after he had taken control of affairs. He then seized his father and took him to Kayseri to take it from his brother who had been given it by his father. He besieged it for a while but then his father Qilij Arslān found an opportunity to flee and enter Kayseri alone. Having learnt of this, Quṭb al-Dīn returned to Konya and Akseray and took control of both. Qilij Arslān continued to be passed from son to son, each of whom found him troublesome, until eventually he came to his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusro, lord of the city of Burghlū.¹⁵ When he saw him, he was delighted, received him with respect, gathered troops and proceeded with him to Konya, which he took. He went then to Akseray, again accompanied by his father Qilij Arslān, and besieged it. However, his father fell ill so he took him back to Konya, where he died and was buried. His son Ghiyāth al-Dīn remained in Konya as ruler there until his brother Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān took it from him, as we shall narrate, God willing.

A reliable source, who knew what he was talking about and had visited those regions, told me a different version, which we shall give now.

Qilij Arslān divided his kingdom among his sons during his lifetime. He gave Tokat to his son Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān, Konya to his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kaykhusro, Ankara, which is called Ankashūriyya, to his son Muḥyī al-Dīn, Malaṭya to his son Mu'izz al-Dīn Qayṣar Shāh, Albistan to his son Mughīth al-Dīn, Kayseri to his son Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd and Sivas and Akseray to his son Quṭb al-Dīn. He also gave Niksār to some other son and Amasyā to his brother's son. [89] These are the kingdom's metropolises, to each of which is annexed its neighbouring small towns. The latter cannot compare with the former.

Qilij Arslān subsequently regretted this and wanted to unite all for his eldest son Quṭb al-Dīn. For him he sought the daughter of Saladin, ruler of Egypt and Syria, in marriage as a strong alliance. When the rest of his sons heard this, they resisted it and rebelled. He lost authority over them and travelled to and fro among them

¹⁴ *Fatḥ*, 451, specifies that Qilij Arslān died on a Thursday.

¹⁵ Sometimes Burlū or Uluburlu. See Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 327-8, where a footnote identifies it as present-day Safranbolu (between Zonguldak and Kastamonu), and Krawulsky, 397: 'small town with a castle'.

as a visitor, remaining with each one for a while and then moving on to another. He came in this general round to his son Kaykhusro, lord of Konya, who went out to meet him, kissed the ground before him and surrendered Konya to him and gave up control of its affairs. He said to Khaykhusro, ‘I want to go to my accursed son Maḥmūd (who was lord of Kayseri) and you to come with me to take it from him.’ So he made preparations, set out with him and put Maḥmūd under siege in Kayseri. However, Qılıj Arslān fell ill and died, so Kaykhusro returned home and each of the sons remained in control of the city he held.

When the lord of Akseray and Sivas Quṭb al-Dīn wished to travel from one of those two cities to the other, he would take a route via Kayseri, where his brother Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd was. It was not on his [direct] route but he followed it to demonstrate love and affection for his brother, although there was treachery in his heart. His brother used to make his way to meet him. On one occasion Quṭb al-Dīn camped outside the city as was his custom and his brother Maḥmūd came to him without any guards. Quṭb al-Dīn killed him and threw his head to his men. He wanted to take the city but his brother’s men within resisted him. Later they yielded it to him on the basis of an agreement they reached.

Maḥmūd had a great emir who used to warn him of his brother Quṭb al-Dīn and [try to] arouse his fears but he did not listen to him. He was a generous and very good man and held the foremost position in the state for Nūr [90] al-Dīn. When Quṭb al-Dīn killed his brother, he killed [this man] Ḥasan with him and threw him on to the highway and a dog came to eat some of his flesh. The people rose up and said, ‘Away with hearing and obeying! This man is a Muslim. He has a madrasah here, a mausoleum, abundant alms and excellent good works. We shall not leave him to be eaten by the dogs.’ So he ordered him to be buried in his madrasah. The sons of Qılıj Arslān continued as they were.

Later Quṭb al-Dīn fell ill and died. His brother Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān, lord of Tokat, went to Sivas which was his neighbour, and seized control of it. From there he went to Kayseri and Akseray. After staying for a little while, he went to Konya, where his brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn was, and after a siege took it. Ghiyāth al-Dīn departed to Syria and then went to Byzantine lands. What happened to him there we shall relate, if God wills. Subsequently¹⁶ Rukn al-Dīn went to Niksār and Amasyā and took them. In the year 597 [1200–1201] he went to Malaṭya, which he also took. His brother Mu’izz al-Dīn left to go to al-Ādil Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb, whose daughter he had married, and remained with him. Rukn al-Dīn united under him all the possessions of all his brothers, apart from Ankara, for it was strong and inaccessible. He then stationed an army to besiege it summer and winter for three years and received its surrender in the year 601 [1204–5]. He arranged for his brother who was there to be assassinated when he left and this was what was done. At about that time Rukn al-Dīn died without having heard of the killing of his brother. God hastened his end because of his severance of the bonds of kinship.

¹⁶ Delete the extra *ilā* before ‘Rukn’.

[91] We have only given this narrative of events¹⁷ here to preserve its continuity and because I did not know the date of each event to record appropriately.

Account of Shihāb al-Dīn's conquest of Ajmer and other places in India

Under the year 583 [1187-88] we have mentioned Shihāb al-Dīn's expedition to India and his defeat. Until this present time there remained great rancour in his heart against the Ghurid troops who had been defeated and the disgrace that clung to them.

In this present year he marched from Ghazna, having gathered his armies, and set out to seek the Indian enemy who had defeated him at that battle. When he arrived at Peshawar, there came before him a Ghurid shaykh who spoke freely to him. He said, 'We have drawn near the enemy but nobody knows where we are going or whom we are seeking and you do not return'¹⁸ a greeting to the emirs. You cannot act like this.' The sultan replied, 'Understand that since this infidel defeated me I have not slept with my wife, nor have I put off my winding-sheet.'¹⁹ I am marching against my enemy and I rely on God, not on the Ghurid troops or anyone else. If God (praise be to Him) gives me and His religion the victory, then it is by His grace and favour. If we are defeated, do not seek for me among those that have fled. Would that I perish under the horses' hooves!' The shaykh said to him, 'You shall surely see what your Ghurid cousins can do. You ought to speak to them and return their greeting.' This he did and the Ghurid emirs continued to be submissive before him [92] and say, 'You will indeed see what we can do'.

He proceeded until he reached the site of the first battle and passed four days' journey beyond it, taking several places in enemy territory. When the Indian [ruler]²⁰ heard this, he made his preparations, gathered his troops and set out to seek the Muslims. When both sides were one day's journey apart, Shihāb al-Dīn withdrew with the enemy at his heels for four stages. The infidel sent to him, saying, 'Give me your hand [on this]. Wait in battle lines to meet me at the gates of Ghazna until I arrive behind you. Otherwise we shall be dismayed. A man like you does not enter lands like a thief, then leave as a fugitive. This is not what sultans do.' Shihāb al-Dīn replied, 'I am unable to meet you in battle.' He continued

¹⁷ For an account, different again in detail, of these Anatolian events and how they influenced Frederick Barbarossa's Crusade, see Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, 111-15.

¹⁸ *Kāmil* continues with the first person plural here. *Kāmil* (Thornberg), xii, 59, has *tarudd*, which is followed here, although it also makes the two preceding verbs third person singular.

¹⁹ The literal translation of the Arabic is 'nor have I changed my clothes of white'. Cf. Dozy, *Supplément*, i, 134, for the phrase *lubs al-bayād* (wearing of white): '*prendre les habits blancs, dans le sens de: se dévouer à la mort*'.

²⁰ The Indian ruler defeated at this second battle of Taraori was Prithvī Rāja, for whom see Ganguly, 'The Age of Prithvīrāja III'.

as he was, retreating until he was three days' journey from Islamic lands, while the infidel still followed in his tracks and eventually caught him up near Maranda. Shihāb al-Dīn then prepared 70,000 of his army and said, 'This night I want you to circle behind the enemy's force and at the time of the dawn prayer to come from that direction while I come from this side.' They followed this plan and dawn broke.

It is the custom of Indians not to leave their beds until the sun has risen. When this day began, the Muslim army charged them from every direction. The drums were beaten but the Indian king paid no attention to that and said, 'Who dares to attack *me*, the man that I am?' The Indians had then lost many men and victory clearly belonged to the Muslims. When the Indian king saw this, he summoned a swift horse of his and mounted up to flee. His leading followers said to him, 'You swore to us that you would not abandon us and flee', so he dismounted, mounted an elephant and held his position, while the battle raged intensely and many of his men died. The Muslims finally reached him and took him prisoner. [93] At that, even more of the Indians were killed or captured. Only a few of them escaped.

The Indian king was brought before Shihāb al-Dīn. He did not bow down, so one of the chamberlains seized his beard and dragged him to the ground until his forehead struck it. He was then seated before Shihāb al-Dīn who asked him, 'If you had taken me prisoner, what would you have done with me?' The infidel replied, 'I would have used a golden chain to fetter you'. Shihāb al-Dīn then said to him, 'We, on the contrary, do not afford you enough importance to fetter you.'

The Muslims took much money and abundant goods from the Indians as plunder. This included fourteen elephants, one of them being the elephant which wounded Shihāb al-Dīn in that [other earlier] battle. The Indian king said to Shihāb al-Dīn, 'If you are seeking land, nobody remains there to guard it; if you are seeking money, then I have monies with all of which you can load your camels.'

Shihāb al-Dīn took him with him to the castle which he had and trusted in, namely Ajmer. He conquered it and took all the lands in the vicinity, all of which he assigned as fiefs to his mamluke Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak. He then returned to Ghazna and put the Indian king to death.²¹

Miscellaneous events

This year the Emir of the Pilgrimage Tāshṭakīn was arrested in Baghdad. He was excellent as the emir, just towards the pilgrims and a loving friend to them. He performed many supererogatory devotions of prayer and fasting [94] and gave much in alms. It is no surprise that his good deeds spoke for him and he was released from prison, as we shall mention, God willing.

²¹ For the Ghurid campaigns up to the conquest of Ajmer, see Habibullah, *Foundation of Muslim Rule*, 44–51.

This year Sultan Tughril ibn Arslān ibn Tughril emerged from confinement after the death of Qizil Arslān ibn İldikiz. He and Qutlugh İnānj ibn Pahlawān ibn İldikiz met in battle and the latter fled to Rayy. What happened then we shall narrate, if God wills, under the year 590 [1194].

In Rajab [13 July-11 August 1192] Emir al-Sayyid ‘Alī ibn al-Murtaḍā al-‘Alawī al-Ḥanafī, the professor at the Sultan’s Mosque in Baghdad, died.

In Sha‘bān [12 August-9 September 1192] Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Būqī, the Shāfi‘ī lawyer from Wāsit, died. He was learned in his school of law and people benefited from him greatly.

Account of the death of Saladin and a little about his character

In Ṣafar of this year [March 1193] Saladin (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb ibn Shādhī), lord of Egypt, Syria, the Jazīra and other lands, died in Damascus.¹ He was born in Takrīt and we have mentioned the reason for the family's move away from there and their becoming rulers of Egypt under the year 564 [1169].²

The reason for his illness was that he went out to meet the pilgrims.³ After returning, he fell ill that same day with a feverish sickness that lasted for eight days and then he died (God have mercy on him).

Before his illness he had summoned his son al-Afḍal ‘Alī and his brother al-Ādil Abū Bakr and consulted them about what he should do. He said, 'We have finished with the Franks. There is nothing to occupy us in this land. Which region shall we attack?' His brother al-Ādil suggested an attack on Khilāṭ, because Saladin had promised him, if he took it, that he would hand it over to him, but his son al-Afḍal suggested an attack on Anatolian lands that were in the hands of the sons of Qilij Arslān. He said, 'They are more extensive lands with more troops and wealth and may be taken sooner. Moreover, they are on the route of the Franks when they come by land. If we take them, we shall deny them passage through them.' He replied, 'Both of you are remiss, lacking in ambition. No, I shall invade Byzantine lands.' He then said to his brother, 'Do you take one of my sons and part of the army and attack Khilāṭ. When I have finished with the lands of Byzantium I shall come to you. We shall enter [96] Azerbaijan and go on to Persian lands, for there is no-one to stop us.' He then ordered his brother al-Ādil to proceed to Kerak, which was held by him, and said to him, 'Make your preparations and then come back ready to start.' After he had travelled to Kerak, Saladin became ill and he died before his return.

Saladin (may God have mercy on him) was generous, forbearing, of good character, humble, ready to put up with something that displeased him, much given to overlooking the faults of his followers, hearing from one of them what displeased him without letting him know that or changing his attitude toward him.

I have heard that he was sitting one day in company when one of the mamlukes

¹ He died early in the morning of Wednesday 27 Ṣafar/= 3 March 1193 (*Fath*, 455; Bahā' al-Dīn, 244).

² For his birth in 532/1137–8 and his early family history, see Bahā' al-Dīn, 18. Cf. above pp. [341–3].

³ He went on a hunting trip with al-Ādil east of Damascus and returned Monday 11 Ṣafar/= 15 February, the time of the Syrian Hajj caravan's return (*Fath*, 454).

threw some boots at another. They missed him but reached Saladin. They missed him too but fell close to him. Saladin turned the other way to speak to his neighbour to pretend he had not noticed.

Once he asked for water but it did not appear. He repeated the request five times in one session but still it did not come. He said, ‘Comrades, by God I am dying of thirst!’ The water was then brought and he drank but did not make any rebuke for the tardiness in bringing it.

Another time he had become so seriously ill, that it was rumoured he had died. After his recovery he was taken to the bath. The water was hot, so he asked for some cold water. When the person attending him brought it, some of the water fell on the ground and some of it splashed him. He suffered from this because of his weak state. Then he asked for more cold water which was fetched. When it was brought close to him, the bowl was dropped and all the water fell on him. It almost killed him, but all he did was to say to the servant, ‘If you intend to kill me, let me know.’ The servant apologized and Saladin overlooked the matter.

As for his generosity, he gave away much, not hesitating about anything he gave away. Sufficient evidence of his generosity is the fact that, when he died, he left only one Tyrian dinar and forty Nāṣirī dirhams in his treasury. I have heard that during his stay at Acre facing the Franks he issued 18,000 mounts, either horses or mules, apart from camels. As for cash, garments and weapons, that is beyond counting. When the Alid dynasty came to an end [97] in Egypt, he took all sorts of things from their storehouses, more than could be counted, but he distributed all of it.

As for his humility, he was open and did not lord it over any of his followers. He used to censure haughty princes for such behaviour. Pious mendicants and Sufis used to attend on him and he would hold devotional sessions for them. When one of them rose to dance or chant, he too would stand and not sit down until the Sufi had finished.

He never wore any [material] that the Sharia disapproves of. He possessed religious learning and understanding and both heard and transmitted Ḥadīth. In short, he was a rare individual in his age, with many good qualities and good deeds, mighty in Jihad against the infidels, for which his conquests are the proof. He left seventeen male children.

Bibliographical References

Manuscript source

Ms. Pococke 346: Bodleian Ms. Pococke 346, 195 folios, completed Tuesday 7 Rajab 691/24 June 1292, covering the years 502–71/1108–76.

Primary sources

- Ansāb*: al-Sam‘ānī, *Kitāb al-ansāb*, ed. Abd al-Rahman ibn Yahya et al., 13 vols, Hyderabad, 1962–82.
- Bāhir*: Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Ta’rīkh al-bāhir fī’l-dawla al-atābakiyya*, ed. A. A. Tolaymat, Cairo, 1963.
- Barq al-shāmī*: ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, *al-Barq al-shāmī*, vol. iii, ed. Muṣṭafā al-Ḥiyārī, Amman, 1986; vol. v, ed. Fāliḥ Ṣāliḥ Ḥusayn, Amman, 1968.
- al-Bīrūnī, *Jamāhir*: Abū'l-Rayhān Muḥammad al-Bīrūnī, *Kitāb al-jamāhir fī ma’rifat al-jawāhir*, Hyderabad, 1355/1936–7.
- Bundārī: al-Faṭḥ ibn ‘Alī al-Bundārī, *Zubdat al-nuṣra wa-nukhbat al-‘uṣra*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, Leiden, 1889.
- Faṭḥ*: ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, *al-Faṭḥ al-quṣṣī fī’l-faṭḥ al-qudsī*, ed. Carlo de Landberg, Leiden, 1888.
- al-Fayrūzabādī, *Muḥīṭ*: Majd al-Dīn al-Fayrūzabādī, *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*, 4 vols, Cairo, 1913.
- Hayşa Bayşa, *Dīwān*: Hayşa Bayşa, *Dīwān*, eds Makkī al-Sayyid Jāsim and Shākir Hādī Shukr, 3 vols, [Baghdad], 1974–5.
- Ibn al-‘Adīm, *Bughya*: Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-‘Adīm, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī ta’rīkh Halab*, ed. Suhayl Zakhkhār, Damascus, 1989.
- Ibn Baṭṭūṭa: Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Rihla*, ed. Ṭalāl Ḥarb, Beirut, n.d.
- Ibn Duqmāq: Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad, Ibn Duqmāq, *Kitāb al-intiṣār li-wāsiṭat ‘iqd al-amṣār*, ed. K. Vollers, Cairo, 1310/1893.
- Ibn al-‘Imrānī: Ibn al-‘Imrānī, *al-Inbā’ fī-ta’rīkh al-khulafā’*, ed. Qasim al-Samarrai, Leiden, 1973.
- Ibn Munīr, *Dīwān*: Ibn Munīr al-Ṭarābulṣī, *Dīwān*, ed. Umar Tadmuri, Beirut, 1986.
- Ibn Qal.: Ibn al-Qalānīsī, *Dhayl ta’rīkh Dimashq*, ed. H. F. Amedroz, Leyden, 1908.
- Ibn Shaddād, *Damas*: ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, *La Description de Damas d’Ibn Šaddād*, ed. Sami Dahan, Damascus, 1956.

- Ibn Shaddād, *Liban*: ‘Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, *Liban. Jordanie, Palestine: Topographie historique d’Ibn Šaddād*, ed. Sami Dahan, Damascus, 1963.
- Ibn Wāṣil: Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Wāṣil, *Mufarrij al-kurūb fī akhbār Banī Ayyūb*, eds Jamal al-Din al-Shayyal et al., 5 vols, Cairo, 1953-77.
- Kāmil*: Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil fī l-ta’rīkh*, 13 vols, Dār Ṣādir ed., Beirut, 1965-7.
- Kāmil* (Thornberg): C. J. Thornberg ed., *Ibn-el-Athiri Chronicon quod Perfectissimum Inscriptitur*, 14 vols, Leiden, 1851-76.
- al-Marzūqī, *Sharḥ dīwān al-Hamāsa*: al-Marzūqī, *Sharḥ dīwān al-Hamāsa*, eds Aḥmad Amīn and ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn, repr. Beirut, 1991.
- al-Maydānī, *Amthāl al-‘arab*: al-Maydānī, *Amthāl al-‘arab (Arabum Proverbia)*, ed. G. W. Freytag, 2 vols, Bonn, 1838-43.
- Midmār*: Muḥammad ibn Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Ayyūbī, *Midmār al-Haqā’iq wa-sirr al-khalā’iq*, ed. Ḥasan Ḥabashī, Cairo, 1968.
- Muntaẓam*: Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-munṭazam*, vols. v-x, Hyderabad, 1357-59/1938-40.
- Mustaqṣā*: al-Zamakhsharī, *al-Mustaqṣā fī amthāl al-‘arab*, 2 vols, Beirut, 1977.
- al-Mutanabbī, *Dīwān*: al-Mutanabbī, *Dīwān (Kitāb al-‘arf al-ṭayyib fī sharḥ dīwān Abī'l-Ṭayyib)*, ed. Nāṣif al-Yāzijī, Beirut, 1882.
- Qalqashandī, *Ansāb al-‘arab*: al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, *Nihāyat al-arab fī ma’rifat ansāb al-‘arab*, ed. Ibrahim al-Ibyari, Cairo, 1959.
- Rawḍatayn*: Abū Shāma, *Kitāb al-rāwḍatayn fī akhbār al-dawlatayn*, ed. Ibrahim al-Zibaq, 5 vols, Beirut, 1418/1997.
- Sanā al-barq*: al-Bundārī, *Sanā al-barq al-shāmī*, ed. Fathīyya al-Nabarāwī, Cairo, 1979.
- Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī: Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir’āt al-zamān*, vol. viii, Hyderabad, 1951.
- Syrische Blitz*: Lutz Richter-Bernburg, intro., ed. and trans., *Der Syrische Blitz; Saladins Sekretär zwischen Selbstdarstellung und Geschichtsschreibung*, Beirut, 1998.
- Şubḥ*: al-Qalqashandī, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī, *Şubḥ al-a’shā fī kitābat al-inshā*, 14 vols, Cairo, 1913-18.
- Subkī, *Tabaqāt*: Tāj al-Dīn al-Subkī, *Tabaqāt al-shāfi’īyya al-kubrā*, 6 vols, Cairo 1324/1906.
- Tārīkh-e Kirmān*: Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, *Tārīkh-e Kirmān; Saljūqiyān va Ghuzz dar Kirmān*, ed. M. E. Bastani Parizi, Tehran, 1964.
- Tijānī, *Rīḥla*: Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh al-Tijānī, *Rīḥlat al-Tijānī*, Tunis, 1378/1958.
- Tirmidhī: al-Tirmidhī, *al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣahīḥ*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf Alhūt, Beirut, n.d.
- ‘Uyūn al-anbā’: Ibn Abī'l-Uṣaybi'a, ‘Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-āṭibbā’, ed. Nizār Ridā, Beirut, n.d.
- Wafayāt*: Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān*, ed. Ihsan Abbas, 8 vols, Beirut 1977.

- Wāfi:* al-Şafadī, *al-Wāfi bi'l-wafayāt*, ed. H. Ritter et al., 1931–in progress.
- Yāqūt: Shihāb al-Dīn Yāqūt al-Rūmī, *Kitāb mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 6 vols, Leipzig, 1866–70.
- Yāqūt, *Irshād*: Yāqūt al-Rūmī, *Irshād al-arīb ilā ma'rifat al-adīb*, ed. D. S. Margoliouth, 7 vols, London, 1923–1931.
- Zamakhsharī: Abū'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd al-Zamakhsharī, *Asās al-balāgha*, Cairo, 1923.
- Ziriklī, *A'lām*: Khayr al-Dīn Ziriklī, *al-A'lām*, Cairo, 1345/1927.
- Zubdat al-ḥalab: Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-'Adīm, *Zubdat al-ḥalab min ta'rīkh Halab*, ed. Sami Dahan, 3 vols, Damascus, 1954–68.
- Zubdat al-tawārīkh: Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Nāṣir al-Ḥusaynī, *Zubdat al-tawārīkh; Akhbār al-umarā' wa'l-mulūk al-saljūqiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Nūr al-Dīn, Beirut, 1406/1986.

Primary material in translation

- Bahā' al-Dīn: Bahā' al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, *The Rare and Excellent History of Saladin or al-Nawādir al-sultāniyya wa'l-mahāsin al-yūsufiyya*, trans. D. S. Richards, Aldershot, 2001.
- Book of Gifts: Book of Gifts and Rarities: Kitab al-hadāyā wa al-tuḥaf*, trans. and annotated Ghāda al-Hijjāwī al-Qaddūmī, Cambridge, Mass., 1996.
- Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr (1): The Chronicle of Ibn al-Athīr for the Crusading Period from al-Kāmil fī'l-ta'rīkh*, Part 1; the years 491–541/1097–1146. *The Coming of the Franks and the Muslim Response*, trans. D. S. Richards, Aldershot, 2006.
- Conquête: 'Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, Conquête de la Syrie et de la Palestine par Saladin*, trans. Henri Massé, Paris 1972.
- Eddé, *Description: 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn Shaddād, Description de la Syrie du Nord*, trad. Anne-Marie Eddé-Terrasse, Damascus, 1984.
- Gibb, *Damascus Chronicle*: H. A. R. Gibb (trans.), *The Damascus Chronicle of the Crusades*, London, 1932.
- Guide to Pilgrimage: [al-Harawī], A Lonely Wayfarer's Guide to Pilgrimage*, trans. with intro. Josef W. Meri, Princeton, 2004.
- Hillenbrand, *Muslim Principality*: Carole Hillenbrand, *A Muslim Principality in Crusader Times: the early Artuqid State*, Istanbul, 1990.
- Ibn Rushd, *Primer*: Ibn Rushd (Averroes), *Bidāyat al-mujtahid wa-nihāyat al-muqtaṣid* (*The distinguished jurist's primer*), trans. Imran Ahsan Khan Nyazee, 2 vols, Reading, 1994–6.
- Lévi-Provençal, *Documents inédits*: E. Lévi-Provençal, *Documents inédits d'histoire almohade*, Paris, 1928.
- Michel le Syrien: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, ed, and trans. J.-B. Chabot, 4 vols, Paris, 1899–1920.

- Nicholson, *Chronicle*: Helen J. Nicholson, *Chronicle of the Third Crusade. A Translation of the Itinerarium Peregrinorum et Gesta Regis Ricardi*, Aldershot, 1997.
- Recueil: Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens orientaux*, eds J. T. Reinaud, S. de Sacy et al., 5 vols, Paris, 1872–1906.
- Richards, *Annals*: *The Annals of the Saljuq Turks: Selections from al-Kāmil fi'l-Ta'rīkh of 'Izz al-Dīn ibn al-Athīr*, trans. and annotated D. S. Richards, London and New York, 2002.
- Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī: Major H. G. Raverty (trans.), *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī; a General History of the Muhammadian Dynasties of Asia etc.*, reprint Delhi, 1970.
- Usāma ibn Munqidh, *Memoirs: Memoirs of an Arab-Syrian Gentleman etc.: Memoirs of Usāmah ibn-Munqidh (Kitāb al-I'tibār)*, trans. Philip K. Hitti, Beirut, 1964.
- William of Tyre: William Archbishop of Tyre, *A History of Deeds done beyond the Sea*, trans. and annot. E. A. Babcock and A. C. Krey, 2 vols, New York, 1976.

Secondary material

- Abun-Nasr, *Maghrib*: Jamil M. Abun-Nasr, *A History of the Maghrib*, Cambridge, 1975.
- Agius, ‘The Arab Šalandī’: Dionisius Agius, ‘The Arab Šalandī’, in U. Vermeulen and J. Van Steenbergen eds, *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk Eras*, Leuven, 2001, 49–60.
- Barthold, *Turkestan*: W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, ed. C. E. Bosworth, 3rd edition, London, 1968.
- Bianquis, *Damas*: Thierry Bianquis, *Damas et la Syrie sous la domination fatimide (359–468/969–1076)*, 2 vols, Damascus, 1986–9.
- Bosworth, ‘Arabic, Persian and Turkish historiography’: C. E. Bosworth, ‘Arabic, Persian and Turkish historiography in the eastern Iranian world’, in *HCCA*, iv, Part Two, 142–52.
- Bosworth, *Later Ghaznavids*: C. E. Bosworth, *The Later Ghaznavids: Splendour and Decay. The Dynasty in Afghanistan and Northern India 1040–1186*, Edinburgh, 1977.
- Bosworth, *Saffarids of Sistan*: C. E. Bosworth, *The History of the Saffarids of Sistan and the Maliks of Nimruz (247/861 to 949/1542–3)*, California and New York, 1994.
- Bosworth, ‘The Iranian world’: C. E. Bosworth, ‘The political and dynastic history of the Iranian world (A.D. 1000–1217)’, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, ed. J. A. Boyle, vol. 5: *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, Cambridge, 1968, 1–202.
- Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur*: Richard W. Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study of Medieval Islamic Social History*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1972.

- Cahen, 'Historiography': Claude Cahen, 'Historiography of the Seljuqid Period', in Bernard Lewis and P. M. Holt eds, *Historians of the Middle East*, Oxford, 1962, 59–78.
- Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*: Claude Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey: A general survey of the material and spiritual culture and history c. 1071–1330*, trans. J. Jones-Williams, London, 1968.
- Cahen, 'Un traité': Claude Cahen, 'Un traité d'armurerie composé pour Saladin', *Bulletin d'Etudes Orientales*, xii, 1947–8, 103–63.
- Casanova, *Citadelle*: Paul Casanova, *Histoire et description de la citadelle du Caire*, Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire, vi, Cairo, 1894.
- Cornu, *Atlas*: Georgette Cornu, *Atlas du Monde Arabo-Islamique à l'époque classique, IXe-Xe siècles*, Leiden, 1985.
- Davidovich, 'The Karakhanids': E. A. Davidovich, 'The Karakhanids,' in *HCCA*, iv, Part One, 119–43
- Dozy, *Supplément*: R. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, 2 vols, Brill, 1881, reprint Beirut, 1968.
- EI(2): The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, H. A. R. Gibb et al. eds, 11 vols, 2nd ed., Leiden, 1960–2002.
- Elisséeff: Nikita Elisséeff, *Nūr ad-Dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades (511–569 H./1118–1174)*, 3 vols, Damascus, 1967.
- Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*: Julie Scott Meisami and Paul Starkey eds, *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, 2 vols, London and New York, 1998.
- Fagnan: E. Fagnan, *Annales du Maghreb et de l'Espagne*, Algiers, 1901.
- GAL: Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 2 vols and 3 Supplement vols, Leiden, 1943–49.
- Ganguly, 'The Age of Prithvīrāja III': D. C. Ganguly, 'The Age of Prithvīrāja III', in R. J. Majumdar ed., *The History and Culture of the Indian People*, vol. v: *the Struggle for Empire*, Bombay, 1957, 104–15.
- Gibb, 'Armies of Saladin': H. A. R. Gibb. 'Armies of Saladin', *Cahiers d'Histoire égyptienne*, iii, Cairo, 1951, 304–20 (reprinted in *Studies on the Civilization of Islam*, eds S. J. Shaw and W. R. Polk, London, 1962).
- Habibullah, *Foundation of Muslim Rule*: A. B. M. Habibullah, *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India. A History of the Establishment and Progress of the Turkish Sultanate of Delhi: 1206–1290 A.D.*, 3rd rev. ed., Allahabad, 1976.
- HCCA*, iv: *History of Civilizations of Central Asia*, vol. iv, *The age of achievement: A.D. 750 to the end of the fifteenth century*. Part One: *The historical, social and economic setting*, eds. M. S. Asimov and C. E. Bosworth, UNESCO, 1998. Part Two: *The achievements*, eds C. E. Bosworth and the late M. S. Asimov, UNESCO, 2000.
- Hinz: Walther Hinz, *Islamische Masse und Gewichte*, Leiden/Köln, 1970.
- Hodgson, 'Ismā'īlī State': Marshall G. S. Hodgson, 'The Isma'īlī State', in J. A.

- Boyle ed., *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 5: *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, Cambridge, 1968, 422–82.
- Hodgson, *Order of Assassins*: Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Order of the Assassins*, The Hague, 1955.
- Idris, *La Berbérie*: H. R. Idris, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zirides Xe-XIIe siècles*, 2 vols., Paris, 1962.
- Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*: E. Lévi-Provençal, *Inscriptions arabes d'Espagne*, Leiden and Paris, 1931.
- Jackson, *Delhi Sultanate*: Peter Jackson, *The Delhi Sultanate: A Political and Military History*, Cambridge, 1999.
- Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*: Hugh Kennedy, *Crusader Castles*, Cambridge, 1994.
- Kohlberg, 'Some Imāmī Shī'ī views': E. Kohlberg, 'Some Imāmī Shī'ī views on the Ṣahāba', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, v, 1984, 143–75.
- Krawulsky: Dorothea Krawulsky, *Irān - Das Reich der Īlhāne: Eine topographisch-historische Studie*, Wiesbaden, 1978.
- Kubiak, 'The burning of Miṣr al-Fuṣṭāṭ': W. Kubiak, 'The burning of Miṣr al-Fuṣṭāṭ in 1168. A reconsideration of historical evidence', *Africana Bulletin*, xxv, 1976, 51–64.
- Lambton, *Continuity and Change*: Ann K. S. Lambton, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia: Aspects of Administrative, Economic and Social History, 11th-14th Century*, Albany, N.Y., 1988.
- Lane, *Lexicon*: E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, 1863–93.
- Lassner, *Topography*: Jacob Lassner, *The Topography of Baghdad in the early Middle Ages*, Detroit, 1970.
- Le Strange, *Baghdad*: G. Le Strange, *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate*, Oxford, 1900.
- Le Strange, *Caliphate*: G. Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge, 1930.
- Le Strange, *Palestine*: G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems: a Description of Syria and the Holy Land from A.D. 650 to 1500*, (London), 1890, reprint Beirut, 1965.
- Le Tourneau, *Almohad Movement*: Roger Le Tourneau, *The Almohad Movement in North Africa in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, Princeton, 1969.
- Lézine, *Mahdiya*: Alexandre Lézine, *Mahdiya: Recherches d'Archéologie Islamique*, Paris, 1965.
- Lyons and Jackson, *Saladin*: M. C. Lyons and D. E. P. Jackson, *Saladin: the Politics of the Holy War*, Cambridge, 1982.
- Makdisi, 'Topography': George Makdisi, 'The Topography of Eleventh Century Baghdad: Materials and Notes (I and II)', *Arabica*, vi (1959), 178–197, 281–309.
- Minorsky, *Studies*: V. Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History*, London, 1953.
- Nizami, 'Ghurids': K. A. Nizami, 'The Ghurids', in *HCCA*, iv, Part One, 177–90.

- Norwich, *Kingdom in the Sun*: John Julius Norwich, *The Kingdom in the Sun 1130–1194*, London, 1970.
- O'Callaghan, *Medieval Spain*: Joseph F. O'Callaghan, *A History of Medieval Spain*, Ithaca and London, 1975.
- Richards, 'Ibn al-Athīr': D. S. Richards, 'Ibn al-Athīr and the later parts of the *Kāmil*: a study of aims and methods', in D. O. Morgan ed., *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, London, 1982, 76–108.
- Richards, 'Saladin's Hospital': D. S. Richards, 'Saladin's Hospital in Jerusalem: its Foundation and Some Later Archival Material', in K. Athamina and R. Heacock eds, *The Frankish Wars and their Influence on Palestine*, Birzeit, 1994, 70–83.
- Richards, 'Some Consideration': D. S. Richards, 'Some Consideration of Ibn al-Athīr's *al-Ta'rīkh al-Bāhir* and its relationship to the *Kāmil*', in C. Vazquez de Benito and M. A. Manzano Rodriquez eds, *Actas XVI Congreso UEAI*, Salamanca, 1995, 443–6.
- Riley-Smith, *Knights of St John*: Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Knights of St John in Jerusalem and Cyprus 1050–1310*, London, 1967.
- Runciman: Steven Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 3 vols, Cambridge, 1952–4.
- Saadé, 'Château de Saladin': G. Saadé, 'Histoire du Château de Saladin', *Studi Medievali*, 3rd series, year IX, 1968, 980–1016.
- Salmon, *Introduction*: Georges Salmon, *L'Introduction topographique à l'histoire de Bagdādh*, Paris, 1904.
- Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles*: R. B. Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles: material for a history up to the Mongol conquest*, reprinted Beirut, 1972.
- Sevim and Bosworth, 'The Seljuqs and the Khwarazm Shahs': A. Sevim and C. E. Bosworth, 'The Seljuqs and the Khwarazm Shahs' in *HCCA*, iv, Part One, 145–75.
- Smith, *Ayyubids and Early Rasulids*: G. R. Smith, *The Ayyubids and Early Rasulids in the Yemen (567–694/1173–1295)*, vol. ii, London, 1978.
- Soucek, *Inner Asia*: S. Soucek, *A History of Inner Asia*, Cambridge, 2000.
- Stevenson, *Crusaders*: W. B. Stevenson, *The Crusaders in the East*, Cambridge, 1907, reprinted Lebanon, 1958.
- Trimingham, *Sufi Orders*: J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, Oxford, 1971.
- Wright: W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 2 vols, third revised edition, Cambridge, 1955.
- Zambaur: E. von Zambaur, *Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie pour l'Histoire de l'Islam*, Hanover, 1927.

Index

The definite article (al-) is ignored for purposes of alphabetical order

- al-'Abbādī the Preacher 41
'Abbās, Emir 9, 10, 11, 13, 23
'Abbās ibn Abī'l-Futūḥ ibn Yahyā ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu'izz ibn Bādīs al-Şanhājī 29, 30, 62, 65, 67, 68
Abbasids vii, 68, 178, 196
'Abd Allāh ibn Birrī ibn 'Abd al-Jabbār ibn Birrī 317
'Abd Allāh ibn Tāhir ibn al-Ḥusayn 125, 126
'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar al Hintātī 63
'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Shaddād 3
'Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr 169
'Abd al-Laṭīf ibn Muḥammad al-Khujandī 303
'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sahl, Abū'l-Fath ibn Abī'l-Qāsim al-Karūkhī al-Harawī 66
'Abd al-Malik ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Aṭā 189
'Abd al-Mughīth ibn Zuhayr al-Ḥarrī 342
'Abd al-Mu'min ibn 'Alī 9, 20, 36, 37, 38, 40, 76, 77, 81–82, 91, 103, 107, 188, 211
Andalusia and 212
Arabs, conflict with 62–63
Banū Hammād and 42–43, 62
Bedouin Arabs and 106–8
Bougie taken by 42–43
death 139
Gibraltar 130
Granada and 133
Ifrīqiya and 103–6
Şanhāja defeated by 43
'Abd al-Nabī, ruler of Zabīd 217–18
'Abd al-Qādir ibn Abī Ṣāliḥ, Abū Muḥammad al-Jilī 162
'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Abd al-Şamad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, Abū'l-Qāsim al-Akkāf al-Nīsābūrī 73
'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ḥājj 132
'Abd al-Rahmān [ibn] Ṭughāyuruk 9–10, 11, 23
'Abd al-Rashīd al-Ash'athī 60
'Abd al-Salām the Maghribī 336
'Abd al-Wāhid ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Hintātī 311
Abū 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 107
Abū 'Abd Allāh 'Isā ibn Hibat Allāh ibn 'Isā al-Bazzāz 34
Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Alī Muhrān 38
Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Būqī 407
Abū 'Alī ibn al-Muqtafi, Emir 114
Abū Bakr al-Dubaysī 89
Abū Bakr Fākhir 132
Abū Bakr Jāndār 132
Abū Bakr al-Mahmūdī 155
Abū Bakr al-Mubārak ibn al-Kāmil ibn Abī Ghālib al-Baghdādī 26
Abū Bakr Naṣr ibn al-'Aṭṭār 195
Abū Bakr al-Shāshī 85
Abū Bakr al-Shayrawī 41
Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 81, 139, 188
Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar ibn Yahyā al-Hintātī 40, 81
Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī 383
Abū Ja'far, brother of al-Mustanjid 114
Abū Ja'far 'Abd al-Wāhid al-Thaqafī 115
Abū Ja'far Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamdīn 9
Abū Ja'far ibn Abī Aḥmad al-Andalusī, vizier 38

- Abū Ja'far Ibn al-Baladī 190–91
 Abū Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Bukhārī 86
 Abū Maṇṣūr Hāshim ibn al-Muṣṭadī 290
 Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 81, 105, 107
 Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Khashshāb 201
 Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Suwayda al-Takrītī 358
 Abū Muḥammad al-Fāriqī 182
 Abū Muḥammad ibn al-Dahhān 127
 Abū Muḥammad ibn Maṭrūḥ 76
 Abū Naṣr Muḥammad, son of al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh 370
 Abū Naṣr Sa'd ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il al-Nu'aymī 109
 Abū Qaṣba 43
 Abū Qubays castle 348
 Abū Qubays Mountain 244
 Abū Sahl al-Šā'lūkī 98
 Abū Sa'id Uthmān ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 82, 133
 Abū Sa'id Yakhluf 43
 Abū Salāma Murshid ibn 'Alī 87, 88, 89
 Abū Sāliḥ ibn al-'Ajāmī 255
 Abū Shāma 3, 4
 Abū Shujā' Farrukhshāh 99
 Abū Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad ibn Salfa al-Īṣfahānī 274
 Abū Ṭālib, uncle of al-Muṣṭanjid 114
 Abū Ṭālib al-Mubārak ibn al-Mubārak al-Karkhī 371
 Abū Ṭālib Naṣr ibn 'Alī al-Nāqid 245
 Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 133, 155, 188, 200–1, 211, 212, 273–4, 299, 301
 Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 300, 311–12, 381–82
 Abū Zakariyyā' al-Maghribī 354
 Abū Zakariyyā' Yahyā ibn Yūmūr 36
 Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn Abī Ghālib 66
 Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Rifā'i 290
 Abū'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn Bakhtiyār ibn 'Alī Mānidā'i 94
 Abū'l-As'ad al-Rāḥmān al-Qushayrī 55
 Abū'l-Badr, son of Ibn Hubayra 65, 69, 78, 84–85
 Abū'l-Barakāt Ja'far ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Thaqafī 170
 Abū'l-Faḍl Hibat Allāh ibn 'Alī ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Šāhib 246
 Abū'l-Faḍl al-Kirmānī 26
 Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Nāṣir ibn 'Alī al-Baghdādī 74
 Abū'l-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn Yūsuf al-Armawī al-Shāfi'i 55
 Abū'l-Faḍl Naṣr ibn Khalaf 155
 Abū'l-Faraj al-Daqqāq 270
 Abū'l-Faraj ibn al-Jawzī 169, 227
 Abū'l-Fawāris Muḥammad ibn Arslān 80
 Abū'l-Futūḥ 'Abd Allāh ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Muẓaffar 73
 Abū'l-Futūḥ 'Alī ibn Faḍl Allāh al-Tughrā'i 157
 Abū'l-Futūḥ al-Fustaqānī 98
 Abū'l-Futūḥ Naṣr ibn 'Abd al-Rāḥmān al-Dāmghānī 269
 Abū'l-Ghamr al-Sā'ib 37
 Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Asākir al-Baṭā'iḥī 247
 Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Abd al-Mu'min 81
 Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Ali ibn Abī'l-Qāsim al-Bayhaqī 59, 205
 Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Dāmghānī 115, 342
 Abū'l-ḥasan 'Alī ibn al-Muqallad 87
 Abū'l-ḥasan 'Alī ibn Yahyā al-Qurashī al-Dimashqī 182
 Abū'l-ḥasan al-Furrāyānī 76
 Abū'l-Ḥasan ibn al-Khul 85
 Abū'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn al-Muẓaffar ibn Alī ibn al-Muslima, Ibn Ra'īs al-Ru'asā' 16
 Abū'l-Hayjā the Fat *see* Ḥusām al-Dīn Abū'l-Hayjā
 Abū'l-Ma'āli ibn Ilkiyā al-Harrāsī 114
 Abū'l-Ma'āli al-Juwaynī 98
 Abū'l-Ma'āli Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan 167
 Abū'l-Murhaf Naṣr ibn 'Alī ibn al-Muqallad 87
 Abū'l-Muẓaffar 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus 342
 Abū'l-Najīb al-Shahrazūrī, Shaykh 38, 55, 170
 Abū'l-Qāsim, a Sufi 150, 151
 Abū'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz

- al-Ḥāmidī 121
 Abū'l-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn al-Muṣṭanṣir
 198
 Abū'l-Qāsim Ṭāhir ibn Sa'īd ibn
 Abī'l-Khayr al-Mihāni 16
 Abū'l-Qāsim 'Umar ibn 'Ikrima ibn
 al-Bazrī al-Shāfi'i 136, 160, 370
 Abū'l-Waqṭ 'Abd al-Awwal ibn 'Isā ibn
 Shu'ayb al-Sijzī 102
 Acre 319, 324–25, 328, 337, 362, 363–66,
 369, 372–74, 378–79, 380, 386–90,
 392, 409
 battles at 366–68, 376–78
 Adana 210
 Aden 218
 'Adī ibn Muṣāfir, an ascetic 137
 al-'Ādid li-Dīn Allāh Abū Muḥammad
 'Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Hāfiẓ,
 Caliph of Egypt 29, 113, 126, 127,
 138, 144, 172, 174, 175, 177, 196,
 197, 198
 al-'Ādil Sayf al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Ayyūb
 (Saladin's brother) 179, 289, 297, 298,
 309, 313–15, 325, 326, 329, 336, 354,
 377, 379, 380, 392, 398, 399–400,
 401, 404, 408
 al-'Ādil ibn al-Salār 29, 30, 62, 64, 67
 al-'Ādil Ruzzik ibn al-Šāliḥ ibn Ruzzik 126,
 138
 'Adud al-Dīn Abū'l-Faraj Muḥammad ibn
 'Abd Allāh 73, 114, 115, 169, 190,
 191, 201, 227, 239, 252, 267
 al-Afḍal, vizier of Egypt 62
 al-Afḍal 'Alī (Saladin's son) 313, 318, 323,
 325, 328, 329, 379, 390, 393, 398,
 399–400, 401, 408
 Afrāsiyāb 116
 Aghlabak al-Kūharā'īnī 118
 Agra 52, 53, 54
 Aḥmad ibn al-Faraj al-Ibarī 73
 Aḥmad ibn Malaḥān 40
 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn
 al-Arrajānī, Abū Bakr 33
 Aḥmad ibn Munīr 149
 Aḥmad ibn Šāliḥ ibn Shāfi'i al-Jīlī 189
 Aḥmad ibn al-Wāthiq bi-Allāh 358
 Aḥmad of Kundur 116
 'Ajām 299
 'Ajāmīs 13, 70, 111
 Ajmer 341
 Akseray 403, 404
 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn Rustum ibn 'Alī
 156
 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn al
 Ghūrī 37, 46–47, 48, 58, 93, 117, 124
 'Alā' al-Dīn Khurramshāh 377, 384, 395
 'Alā' al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Mas'ūd 37–38
 'Alā' al-Dīn Tekesh *see* Khwārazm Shāh
 Tekesh
 'Alā' al-Dīn Tunāmish 228, 238, 239, 240,
 359, 374
 Alamut castle 10, 91
 Albistan 403
 Aleppo 7, 8, 24, 28, 39, 110, 142, 233,
 241, 243–44, 277–78, 279, 287,
 293–95, 298, 334, 367, 376
 Alexandria 164–65, 229–30, 268
 Alfonso, King of Toledo (Alfonso VIII of
 Castille) 36, 91, 212
 Algeciras 91
 'Alī Beg, Qarluq Turk 81
 'Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Khurasān 103
 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Mashṭūb al-Hakkārī 305
 'Alī ibn Dubays ibn Ṣadaqa 15, 23, 30, 38
 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan, Ismā'ilī chief 111
 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Zaynabī 33
 'Alī ibn Ishāq, the Almoravid 3, 301, 302,
 310–11
 'Alī ibn Khaṭṭāb ibn Ẓafar 342
 'Alī ibn Mas'ūd, Cadi 57, 58
 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Sā'atī 266
 'Alī ibn al-Mu'izz ibn al-Mu'tazz 273–74
 'Alī ibn al-Murtaḍā al-'Alawī al-Ḥanafī
 407
 'Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā 59, 125
 'Alī ibn Rāfi' ibn Khalīfa al-Shaybānī 33
 'Alī al-Mūsāwī 59
 Alids 29, 47, 59, 68, 97, 99, 100, 109, 113,
 124, 196, 218, 219, 357, 409
 Almeria 41, 91
 Almohads vii, 3, 9, 41, 43, 63, 81, 82, 104,
 133, 134, 155, 273, 301–2, 310–11,
 382
 Almoravids 3, 40, 91, 310–11, 312
 Alp Arslān, son of Sultan Maḥmūd 7
 Alp Arslān ibn Ṭughril, Prince 70
 Alp Ghāzī, nephew of Ghiyāth al-Dīn 206,
 207, 208

- Alpqush Kūn Khar, Emir 10, 13, 15, 23, 30, 69, 70
 Amasyā 403, 404
 Amaury, king of the Franks 172, 234
 Āmid 284, 290, 291–92
 Amīr Amīrān ibn Zankī, Nuṣrat al-Dīn 110, 111, 149
 Amīrak al-Jāndār 111
 Anatolia 80, 157
 Andalusia vii, 106, 107, 108, 133, 188, 299, 300
 ‘Abd al-Mu’min and 9, 40–41, 200–1
 Frankish captures 15
 Muslim captures 91
 Ānī 74, 129
 Ankara 403, 404
 Antartus 345
 Antioch 79, 87, 148, 200, 345, 346, 351, 353–54, 367, 375
 Apamea castle 36
 Aqsīs, brother of Khwārazm Shāh Atsiz 77
 Āqsunqur al-Āḥmadīlī 110, 168, 237
 Arabs 62–63, 77, 81, 130, 155, 310–11, 382, 397
 Arafat, Mount 136, 151, 339–40
 Arghush, Emir of Pilgrimage 128, 132
 Arghush, lord of Basra 82
 Arghush al-Mustarshidī 95, 166
 Armenia 66
 Armenians 8, 210, 375
 ‘Arqa 165, 200
 Arrāniyya 11
 Arslān Beg 9–10
 Arslān Būqā 58, 123
 Arslān [Shāh] ibn Ṭughril ibn Muhammad ibn Malikshāh, Sultan 69, 70, 84, 112, 121, 122, 123, 140, 166, 211
 Arslān Shāh ibn Ṭughril ibn Qāwurt 188
 Arsūf 390
 Artāḥ 15
 al-Aryār river 152
 Asad al-Dīn Shīrkūh ibn Shādī 110, 118, 144–46, 151, 163–65, 171–75, 176, 177, 258, 370
 death 175–76
 Asad al-Dīn Yarunqush 307, 308
 Asadī emirs (Asadiyya) 196, 254
 Ascalon 30, 194, 253, 328
 demolition 391–92
 Franks capture 64–65, 71
 reconstruction 396
 Saladin captures 329–30
 ‘Ashtarā 185
 Asqīl 115
 Astarābād 109–10
 astrology 317
 ‘Aṭā ibn Ḥaffāz al-Sulamī 71
 Atabeg dynasty 2, 4
 Athīr al-Dīn 157
 Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) 115
 Awḥad al-Zamān 27
 ‘Awn al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Hubayra, Abū'l-Muẓaffar, vizier 16, 32–33, 44, 65, 69, 70, 77, 82, 84, 114, 118, 120, 122, 123, 128, 159, 160
 Ay-Takīn, Emir 140, 154
 Ay-Tāq, Emir 92–93, 117–18, 140, 156
 Aybak al-Sāqī 363
 ‘Aydhab 289
 Aydhū fort 348
 Aydughdī al-Turkomanī 45
 Ayla 289
 ‘Ayn al-Dawla al-Yārūqī 177, 178
 ‘Ayntāb 292, 295
 Ayāz the Tall 390
 A'zāz castle 243, 244, 295
 Azerbaijan 121, 135, 408
 al-‘Azīz ‘Uthmān (Saladin's son) 309, 313
 Baalbek 11, 71, 94, 186, 234–35, 249–50, 260, 268
 Baalbek castle 11, 71, 176
 Bābayn 163, 164
 Badr al-Ḥuwayzī 41
 Baghdad:
 city wall repaired 23
 fighting in 23–24, 83, 120, 128, 227, 228, 245, 257–58, 312
 fires at 85, 137, 143, 195, 215, 226, 342
 Jews in 257–58
 refugees 26
 sickness in 38
 siege 110
 sinful behaviour in 280
 Baghrās 349, 352–53
 Bahā' al-Dīn ibn Nīsān 291
 Bahā' al-Dīn Qarāqūsh al-Asadī 180, 196–97, 373

- Bahā' al-Dīn Sām, lord of Bāmiyān 205, 206
 Bahrābād 60
 Bahrām Shāh ibn Mas'ūd ibn Ibrāhīm, lord of Ghazna 25, 47, 64
 Bahrām Shāh ibn Ṭughril ibn Qāwurt 188
 Bakās castle 348
 Bakhtiyār, Emir 56–57
 Bakimzā, battle of 70
 Balāṭunūs 348
 Balad 7
 Baldwin IV, King of Jerusalem 264
 Baldwin of Ramla 264
 Balian ibn Bīrzān, lord of Ramla 330, 332, 402
 Balkh 56, 58, 140, 141, 155
 Bandanijīn 77, 109, 252
 Banū 'Āmir 397–98
 Banū Asad 142–43
 Banū 'Awf 70
 Banū Ḥammād 2, 20, 43, 301
 Banū Hazn 215
 Banū Ka'b 215
 Banū al-Kanz 230–31
 Banū Khafāja 128, 215, 398
 Banū Kilāb 171
 Banū Mālik 171
 Banū Maṭrūḥ 14
 Banū Munqidh 89, 217
 Banū Qurra 14
 Banū Riyāḥ 106, 107
 Bānyās 22, 145, 148–50, 166, 225–26, 262, 264
 Ba'qūbā 84
 Ba'rīn castle 236–37
 Barjam al-Īwa'i 101, 215
al-Barq al-shāmī 3
 Barziyya 349–52
 Bashīr the Eunuch 287, 296, 303
 Basra 128, 166, 397–98
 Bāṭinīs 10, 243
 Bayhaq 116
 Baysān 283, 297
 Bayt Jibrīl 330
 Beaufort fortress 360
 Bedouin Arabs 35, 101–2, 104, 106–8, 128, 195, 290, 366
 Beirut 166, 327, 400, 402
 siege of 283
 Bethlehem 330
 Bikisrā'il 346
 Bilbays 145, 172
 al-Bira castle 279–80, 284
 Bisṭām 139, 154
 Bohemond III, lord of Antioch 31, 79, 147, 148, 345, 346, 349, 352, 353–54, 367, 402
 Bône 63–64, 76
 Bosworth, C. E. 3
 Bougie 20, 301–2, 310
 Bughrātakīn Buzghush al-Jārkānī 117, 118
 Bukhara 153
 al-Bundari 3
 al-Buqay'a 141, 147
 Burhān al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim Manṣūr ibn Abī Sa'īd Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr Ahmād al-Sā'idī 94
 al-Būrī, Abū'l-Muẓaffar Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Shāfi'i 202
 Bushanj 132–33
 Būz-Aba, Emir 10, 11, 13, 23
 Būz-Aba, mamluke of Taqī al-Dīn 'Umar 310, 314
 Buzān, Emir 78
 Byzantines 210–11, 367, 387
 Byzantium, Emperor of *see* Comnenos, Emperor Manuel
 Caesarea 326, 390
 Cairo 29, 30, 68, 69, 145, 163, 164, 171, 172, 173, 175
 New 249
 Old 172, 173, 174, 179–80, 194, 249
 Chaghri Khan ibn Ḥasan Takīn, Khan 153
 Chinese Great Khan 153
 Christians 104
 Coloman, Constantine (Byzantine Duke) 141, 147, 148, 155, 157, 228
 Comnenos, Emperor Manuel 32
 Conrad III, Emperor 21, 22
 Conrad of Montferrat (the Marquis) 328, 335, 360, 389, 391, 396–97
 Constance, daughter of Bohemond II of Antioch 31
 Constantine 301–2
 Constantine castle 42
 Constantinople 374, 375
 Cordoba: Franks' siege and 36–37

- Ceuta 91
 Cyprus 387
- Dahhāk al-Bīqā'ī 94
 Dā'i ibn Muḥammad 129
 Dakalā, lord of Fars 110, 118
 Damascus 142, 144, 165, 176, 225, 354,
 408
 Amīr Amīrān and 110
 Franks attack 285
 Nūr al-Dīn takes 30, 71–72, 73, 94
 Saladin takes 321
 Dāmghān 139, 154
 Damietta 183–84, 230, 283
 Daqūqā 74
 Dārā castle 16
 Darbsāk 349, 352
 Dārūm 330, 398
 Dā'ūd ibn 'Isā, Emir of Mecca 244, 245
 Dawlat Shāh, lord of Badlīs and Arzan 288
 Delhi 54
 Dhakhr al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim Zayd ibn
 al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasanī 98, 99, 100
 Dhū'l-Nūn ibn Muḥammad ibn
 Dānišmand 157, 213
 Dihistan 140, 156
 Dildirim al-Yarūqī 295, 319
 Dīnār, an Oghuz emir 56, 204
 Dīnawar 84
 Ḫirghām, vizier 138, 144, 145
 Ḫiyā' al-Dīn Ḫākārī, the Lawyer
 177, 214, 253–54, 314, 325, 370–71
 Ḫiyā al-Mulk Muḥammad ibn Abī Ṭālib
 Sa'd ibn Abī'l-Qāsim Maḥmūd al-Rāzī
 159
 Diyar Bakr 147, 148–49, 167
 Dulūk 45
 Dvin 135
- earthquakes 32, 75, 87, 185–86, 245–46,
 256
 Edessa 225, 284
 rebellion of 8
 Egypt 29, 112, 126, 163–64, 370
 Abbasids 196
 Asad al-Dīn's conquest 171–75
 caliphs 64
 Franks and 146, 147, 171, 173, 174, 179,
 183, 229–30
- Nūr al-Dīn and 144, 145, 147, 214
 Saladin and 164, 165, 174, 176–79,
 183–84, 214, 229–30, 249
 vizierate 62, 64
 Eschiva of Bures, lady of Tiberias 315,
 316, 321
 Euphrates 44, 192, 284
- Faḍlūn ibn Maḥmūd, ruler of Ānī 74
 al-Fā'iz bi-Naṣr Allāh Abū'l-Qāsim Ḫākārī ibn
 al-Zāfir bi-Amr Allāh Ismā'il 68, 112
 Fakhr al-Dawla Abū'l-Muẓaffar al-Ḥasan
 ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Muṭṭalib 290
 Fakhr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Masīḥ 168, 186, 193,
 225
 Fakhr al-Dīn Mas'ūd ibn Abī 'Alī al-
 Zāfarānī, Emir 171, 233, 236, 284
 Fakhr al-Dīn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā'ūd, lord
 of Ḫisn Kayfā 28, 131, 147, 167
 Falak al-Dīn Sulaymān, brother of al-'Ādil
 399
 famine 261–62, 270
 Fāris al-Dīn Maymūn al-Qaṣrī 396
 Farrukhshāh ibn Maḥmūd al-Kāsānī 72
 Fars 123, 130, 180–81
 Fatḥ al-Karāmī 150
al-Fatḥ al-quṣṣī 3
 Fatimā, Lady 16
 Fatimids 138, 194, 196, 218, 219
 Fayd 152
 al-Findalawī, Yūsuf ibn Dirbās 21
 Firūzshāh Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Qumāj
 99
 Firūzkūh 46, 47, 52
 fleets 9, 18, 20
 actions 292–93, 336, 346–47
 Ford of Lamentations 264–65
 Fraga fortress 26
 Franks:
 'Abbas (vizier of Egypt) killed by 68, 69
 'Abd al-Mu'min and 133
 besiege
 Acre 363–66, 369, 372–74, 378–79,
 380, 386–90
 Bānyās 225–26
 Cordoba 36–37
 Damascus 21–22
 Damietta 183–84
 Hama 254–55, 260

- Konya 375
- besieged
- Ḩarim 79, 134, 146–47, 256
 - Kerak 184, 213–14
 - Tyre 336–37
- capture
- Andalusia, parts of 1, 26
 - Ascalon 64–65, 71
 - Bône 63–64
 - al-Mahdiyya 18
 - Tinnis 65
- captured from
- Baghrâs 352
 - Bânyâs 148, 265–66
 - Barziyya 349–52
 - Darbsâk 352
 - Ḩabis Jaldak 281–82
 - Ḩârim 146–48, 149
 - Hûnîn 338
 - Jabala 345–46
 - Jerusalem 330–35
 - Kawkab 338–39, 344, 355
 - Kerak 354–55
 - Lattakia 346
 - Munayṭira 161
 - Safed 355, 356
 - Şahyûn 347–48
 - Sarmîniyya 349
 - Shaqif Arnûn 360–61
 - al-Shughr 348–49
- defeat, Yaghrà 24–25
- dispute among 315–16
- Egypt and 17, 147, 149, 163–64, 171, 173, 174, 183, 219, 229–30
- Ford of Lamentations and 264
- Nûr al-Dîn and 24–25, 45–46, 130–31, 141–42, 144, 145
- peace treaty with 401–2
- raids on
- Damascus 262
 - Ḩawrân 209
 - Homs 258
- Syria and 146, 183, 200, 315
- territory of captured 15, 22, 36, 73, 76–77, 91, 103–6, 146, 165
- True Cross 322–23, 389
- Frederick I (Barbarossa), Emperor 364, 374–75
- Fûla 326
- Fûmâ, Qarakhitay general 203, 204
- Gabès 13–14, 19, 76, 211
- Gafsa 105, 273–74, 311, 312
- Ganja 162
- Gaza 330
- George of Antioch 18, 19, 20, 32
- Georgians 66, 129, 130, 135, 152, 162
- Germans, king of (Frederick Barbarossa) 364, 374–75
- al-Ghaḍbân al-Khafâjî 215
- al-Gharraf 238
- GHâzî ibn Ḥassân al-Manbijî 167
- Ghazna 25–26, 46, 47, 49, 58, 64, 150, 340, 405
- Ghaznavids 2
- Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kaykhusro ibn Qilij Arslân 403, 404
- Ghiyâth al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Sâm (Ghurid) 48–49, 50, 51–52, 53, 54, 78, 203, 205, 206, 207, 208, 382
- Ghûr 25–26, 49, 51, 53, 117, 124, 154
- Ghiyâth al-Dîn and 48
 - Herat taken by 37, 52
 - Sanjar and 46–48
- Ghulbeg (a mamluke) 90
- Ghumâra tribes 154–55
- Ghurids viii, 2, 58, 133, 140–41, 207, 341, 405
- Ghuzoglu, Emir 252
- Gibb, H. A. R. 3–4
- Giza 180
- Granada 40–41, 91, 133, 134
- Greek fire 245, 373
- Greeks 210
- Grenville, G. S. P. 2
- Guadix 40
- Guy of Lusignan, King of Jerusalem 316, 323–24, 329, 360
- Ḩabis Jaldak 281–82
- Hadîthat Āna 382
- al-Ḥâfiẓ Abû'l-Qâsim ibn 'Asâkir 22
- al-Ḥâfiẓ li-Dîn Allâh 'Abd al-Majîd, Fatimid Caliph 20, 29
- Haifa 326, 390
- Ḩalba 165
- Hama 28, 87, 233, 234, 235, 236, 254–55, 260

- Hamadhan 13, 61, 62, 78, 82, 84, 100, 110, 112, 118, 122, 124, 135
 Ḥammū ibn Ghāniya 91
 Ḥānī 386
 Ḥarb al-‘Alawī 129
 Ḥārim 31, 145, 146–48, 255, 256
 Ḥarrān 110–11, 225, 304, 308–9
 al-Ḥasan ibn al-‘Abbās ibn Rustum, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Īsfahānī al-Rustumī 162
 al-Ḥasan [ibn ‘Alī] ibn Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz ibn Bādīs al-Ṣanhajī 103, 104, 106
 al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Yaḥyā ibn Tamīm 14, 18–20, 42
 al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib 191
 al-Ḥasan ibn Dhī'l-Nūn ibn Abī'l-Qāsim ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Mis'arī, Abū'l-Mafākhīr al-Nīsābūrī 38
 al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Arsābandī 58
 Ḥasan ibn Tha’lab 20, 63
 Ḥasan al-Jāndār 70
 Ḥassān al-Manbijī 73
 Ḥaṭṭīn 3, 322–24, 339
 Ḥawrān 209
 ḥayṣa Bayṣa 27, 44, 168, 263
 Hebron 399
 Henry of Troyes, Count of Champagne (Count Henry) 377, 378, 397, 402
 Herat 37, 52, 54, 61, 93, 116, 140, 154, 156–57, 205
 Hibat Allāh ibn al-Faḍl ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad, Abū'l-Qāsim al-Mattūthī 143
 al-Hilla 33, 38, 44, 45, 166
 Hindi the Kurd 70
 Ḥiṣn al-Akrād 141, 142, 344, 364
 Ḥiṣn Kayfā 16, 38, 131, 147, 167
 Ḥiṭṭān ibn Kāmil ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī 276, 277, 282
 Homs 29, 72, 87, 142, 165, 172, 176, 233–34, 235, 258
 Horn Mountain 107, 108
 Hospitallers 319, 320, 324, 335, 339, 345, 356
 Hugh of Galilee 264
 Hugh II Embriaco 323
 Ḥulwān 32, 84, 189
 Humām al-Dīn Tatar, Emir 280
 al-Ḥumaydī 26
 Humphrey of Toron 262
 al-Ḥurra 217, 218
 ḥūnīn 166, 338
 ḥusām al-Dīn Abū'l-Hayjā 230, 285, 366, 380, 393
 ḥusām al-Dīn Būlaq Arslān 302
 ḥusām al-Dīn Lu'lū' 289, 330–35, 370
 Husām al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Lājīn 318, 326, 395
 Husām al-Dīn Timurtāsh ibn Īlghāzī 16, 28, 55, 186
 al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī Ṭālib al-‘Alawī al-Fārisī 129
 al-Ḥusayn ibn Kharmīl al-Ghūrī 54
 al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad (Ibn al-Sībī) 181–82
 al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Arsābandī 57
 al-‘Ibādī the Preacher 10, 11, 23
 īldikiz, lord of Azerbayjan, Atabeg 70, 78, 84, 112, 121, 122–24, 135, 140, 158, 166, 168, 181, 188, 192, 211, 215
 īnānj, mamluke 61–62, 181
 īsā, Kurdish emir 250–51
 īsā ibn Ḥasan 63
 īsā ibn Qāsim ibn Abī Hāshim, Emir of Mecca 129–30, 151
 Ibiza 105
 Ibn Afḍal al-Zamān 371
 Ibn al-Āmidī 85
 Ibn al-Anbārī 143, 280
 Ibn Āqsunqur al-Āḥmadīlī 122, 123, 135
 Ibn al-‘Aşṣār 275
 Ibn al-Athīr:
 Atabeg dynasty and 4
 brother 242
 comprehensiveness desired by vii
 estimation of 3–4
 family 1
 father 152–53
 grandmother 136
 life 1
 Nūr al-Dīn and 4
 Saladin and 4
 scope of vii
 Ibn al-‘Aṭṭār 257
 Ibn al-Baladī, Vizier 169, 181–82, 191
 Ibn al-Bāzdār 123
 Ibn Dārust 10–11

- Ibn al-Dāya Majd al-Dīn Abū Bakr 39, 171, 189
 Ibn Farjala 172
 Ibn Funduq 2
 Ibn al-Ḥājjī al-Ashnānī 99
 Ibn Hubayra *see* ‘Awn al-Dīn Yahyā
 Ibn al-Jawzī 2
 Ibn al-Khāfi 152
 Ibn al-Khallāl 195
 Ibn al-Khayyāt 12
 Ibn al-Khujandī 100, 152
 Ibn Makaliya 95
 Ibn Mardanīsh, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad (Almoravid) 40–41, 91, 133, 134, 188, 200
 Ibn Ma’rūf, chief of Muntaqi 142–43
 Ibn Maṣāl 29–30
 Ibn al-Mu’awwij (palace chamberlain) 245, 257
 Ibn al-Munajjim al-Miṣrī 246
 Ibn al-Muqaddam, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik 28, 223, 224, 231–32, 249, 250, 260–61, 266, 290, 339–40
 Ibn al-Murakhkham, Cadi 115
 Ibn al-Qalānisī 3
 Ibn al-Qaysarānī 24–25, 31
 Ibn al-Rā’ī 126
 Ibn al-Razzāz 85
 Ibn al-Rūmī 36
 Ibn Sadīd al-Dawla al-Anbārī 269
 Ibn Ṣafiya 190
 Ibn al-Sallār 62, 64, 67
 Ibn Sankā 161, 166, 180, 226
 Ibn al-Ṭalāya, Abū'l-‘Abbās Ahmad 66
 Ibn Ṭughyuruk 123
 Ibn Yūmūr 37
 Ibn al-Zaghūnī 258
 Ibrāhīm, Kurdish emir of Fanak 250–51
 Ibrāhīm ibn Hamushk 40–41, 133, 134
 Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Dānishmand, Prince 157
 Ibrāhīm ibn Nabahān al-Ghanawī al-Raqqī 26
 Ibrīm castle 210
 Ifrīqiya vii, 3, 14, 30, 32, 310–12
 famine in 16–17
 Frankish captures in 18
 Frankish losses in 76, 103–6
 Turks in 211
 Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Ḥasan 403
 ‘Imād al-Dīn 193, 369
 ‘Imād al-Dīn [Abū Bakr] ibn Qarā Arslān 307
 ‘Imād al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Dāmghānī 33
 ‘Imād al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Alawī al-Ḥusaynī 97
 ‘Imād al-Dīn al-Isfahānī, the Secretary 3, 242, 369
 ‘Imād al-Dīn Ṣandal 198
 ‘Imād al-Dīn Zankī ibn Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd 186, 192, 193, 235, 241, 279, 293–95, 344, 350, 374, 377, 379
 al-‘Imādiyya castle 168
 Inab fortress 31
 Inānch, ruler of Rayy 121, 122–24
 India viii, 25, 49, 52, 53–54, 340–41, 405–6
 Iraq 11, 23–24, 30–31, 216
 Banū Asad expelled 142–43
 earthquakes 185
 locusts 11
 prices 26, 33
 sickness in 38
 Irbil 296, 299, 380, 381
 Isfahan 13, 77, 94, 100, 158, 395
 Isfarā’īn 60, 132
 Ismā’īl ibn al-Muhsin 59
 Ismā’īlis 37, 38, 72, 85, 101, 111, 124, 130, 137, 155, 158, 249
 İştakhr castle 123
 ‘Izz al-Dawla Abū'l-Ḥasan ‘Alī 88
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū Bakr al-Dubaysī 23
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Abū'l-Fulayta Qāsim ibn al-Muhammad al-‘Alawī al-Ḥusaynī, emir of Medina 354
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Arsul al-Asadī 388
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Farrukhshāh (Saladin’s nephew) 262, 264–65, 268, 274, 276, 282, 283, 290
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Īsā ibn Mālik, Emir 331
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Jāwulī 388
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Jūrdik 175, 233, 338, 390, 402
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Maḥmūd Zulfandār 225, 231–32, 235, 236, 241, 242, 296, 297, 305
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd ibn Quṭb al-Dīn

- Mawdūd 192, 235, 241, 242, 271, 278, 279, 284, 287, 288–89, 296, 299, 304, 305, 308–9, 381, 384, 393
- Izz al-Dīn ‘Uthmān ibn al-Zanjīlī 218, 277, 282–83
- Jabala 345–46
- Jacob’s House (ford) 264
- Jaffa 326, 390, 398, 400–1
- Jalāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Jamāl al-Dīn Abī Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Abī Maṇṣūr, Vizier 242, 246, 342
- Jalāl al-Dīn al-Mu'ayyad al-Muwaffaqī 129
- Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad Khan, Qarakhanid prince 96, 98, 125
- Jalāl al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus 357
- Jalāliqa 36
- Jamāhiyya fort 348
- Jamāl al-Dīn Abū 'Alī ibn Rawāḥa al-Ḥamawī 367
- Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī (vizier) 1, 7–8, 27, 28, 112, 150–53, 246, 258
- Jamāl al-Dīn Sharwīn ibn Ḥasan al-Zarzārī 331
- al-Janāḥ (brother of al-Mashṭūb) 401
- Janad castle 218
- Jāwulī, Asadiyya commander 243
- Jāwulī al-Asadī 265
- Jāwulī al-Tughrīlī 11
- Jazīra 224–25, 310, 344
- Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar 1, 75, 89, 152, 160, 187, 250, 271, 296, 370, 384, 385
- Jerusalem 183, 294, 363, 392, 393–94, 398
- king of 145
- Patriarch 330, 333
- queen of 333
- Saladin's conquest of 4, 316, 330–35
- Jews 104
- Jihad vii, 4
- Jordan depression 283
- Joscelin the Frank 8, 39
- Ju'ayfar 182
- Jubāra ibn Kāmil 63, 107
- Jubayl 327–28
- Jurjān 96, 97, 140, 156
- Juwaniyya 131
- Juwayn 60, 136
- Kafar Kannā 365
- Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Fadall Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī 44, 193, 213, 215, 223–24, 232
- Kamāl al-Dīn Abū'l-Qāsim 85
- Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥamza ibn 'Alī ibn Talha 131
- Kamāl al-Dīn al-Sumayramī 211
- Kāmil*:
- dates 2
 - edition translated 1
 - sources 2–4
 - transliteration 2
- al-Kāmil Shujā' ibn Shāwar 138, 165, 174, 175
- Kawkab 338, 339, 344, 355–57
- Kaykhusro, King 116
- Kayseri 157, 403, 404
- Kelibia, castle of 20
- Kerak 184, 213–14, 282, 318–19
- Kerman 80, 188
- Khalaj 49, 53, 54
- Khalīl al-Hakkārī 367
- Khāliṣ the eunuch 359
- Khāqān Maḥmūd ibn Arslān 96–97
- Kharnak al-Ghūrī 52
- al-Kharrūba 369, 377
- Khartibirt 307
- Kharwash al-Ghūrī 48
- Khāṣṣ Beg ibn āqsunqur 70
- Khāṣṣ Beg ibn Balankirī 10–11, 23, 24, 30, 44, 45
- Khilāt 122, 306, 308, 386, 408
- Khitay 56, 203, 204, 205, 206
- Khumārtakīn 234
- Khurasan 26, 41, 50, 52, 55, 56, 59, 61, 72, 81, 101, 382
- army 77
- Ay-Tāq and 93
- bandits damage 116
- famine 94
- hail 136
- Oghuz and 96–97
- pilgrims attacked 92
- Sultan Arslān and 139
- Khurasan Road 84
- Khurasanians 49, 53

- Khusrojird castle 116
 Khusroshāh ibn Bahrām Shāh 49, 50, 56, 117
 Khuṭlubars, Emir of Wāsiṭ 82, 95, 161
 Khuzistan 74, 77, 100–1
 Khwājikī, lord of Shahristan 129
 Khwārazm 80, 117, 203, 205, 207, 209
 Khwārazm Shāh Atsiz ibn Muḥammad ibn Anūshakīn 70, 77, 79, 81
 Khwārazm Shāh Īl Arslān ibn Atsiz 80, 140, 156, 201, 203, 205
 Khwārazm Shāh Tekesh ibn Īl Arslān 107, 181, 203–5, 207, 208–9
 al-Kiyā al-Şabbāhī 137
 Konya 80, 157, 375, 403
 Kufa 45
 Kūla, Indian ruler of al-Siwālik 341
 Kumushtakīn, lord of Basra 161, 166
 Kumushtakīn, Sa‘d al-Dīn, Emir 193, 231, 233, 234, 241, 255–56
 Kurds 135, 166, 176, 180, 181, 310, 330
 Kurstān 132
 Kūwat Rām 341
 Lahore 49–50, 51, 150
 Latrun 330, 392–93
 Lattakia 200, 346
 Leon the Armenian 272, 375
 Lérida fortress 26
 Levant 165
 al-Lihf 70, 77, 95, 109
 Lur Kurds 101
 Maghrib vii, 299
 famine in 18, 26, 139
 rebellion in 154–55
 Mahdi Muḥammad ibn Tūmart 82
 Mahdiyya 3, 14, 19, 20, 30, 43, 64, 76, 77, 103–6
 al-Māhiyānī 25
 Māhkī castle 13, 109, 166
 Maḥmūd ibn [Arslān Khān] Muḥammad
 ibn Bughrā Khān, Rukn al-Dīn
 (Qarakhanid ruler) 60, 81, 90–91, 93, 96–98, 115, 116, 125
 Maḥmūd ibn Malikshāh ibn Maḥmūd 123, 166, 252
 Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh,
 Sultan 10, 77, 211
 Majd al-Dīn Abū'l-Faḍl ibn al-Şāhib 267, 341–42
 Majd al-Dīn al-'Alawī 121, 206
 Majd al-Dīn ibn Rashīq 386
 Majd al-Dīn Mubārak (brother of Ibn al-Athīr) 1
 Majdal Yāba 325
 Majorca 3, 91
 Māksin 7, 28
 Malaga 91, 133
 Malaṭya 157, 271, 272, 395, 403, 404
 Ma'layā 326
 Malazgird 386
 Mālik ibn Anas 139
 Malikshāh ibn Khusroshāh al-Mahmūdī,
 Ghaznavid 51, 117, 150
 Malikshāh ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad
 30, 44, 45, 74, 77, 78, 84, 96, 100–1,
 110, 118, 122
 Manbij 73, 167
 Manklī Takīn 204–5
 Mankubars al-Mustarshidī 101
 Manṣūr ibn Nabīl 345
 Marāgha 168, 169
 Maranda 406
 Maraqqiyya 345
 Mar'ash 213
 Mardin 16
 Marj 'Uyūn 360, 400
 battle of 264
 Marquis, the *see* Conrad of Montferrat
 Marrakech 9, 63, 134, 212
 Marv 56, 57, 58, 59, 81, 141, 157, 204, 206, 208
 al-Mashṭūb, Sayf al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Ahmad
 al-Hakkārī 177, 304, 379, 388, 389, 401
 Massisa 210
 Mas'ūd [ibn] Bilāl 11, 23, 24, 44, 65, 69, 70
 Mas'ūd ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh,
 Sultan 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 23–24, 30, 38, 85, 121–22
 death 43
 Mas'ūd ibn al-Nādir 383
 Mas'ūd ibn Qilij Arslān ibn Sulaymān ibn Qutlumush, 39, 80, 155, 157
 Mas'ūd ibn Zimām (Mas'ūd the Axeman)
 107, 108, 211, 274

- Mas'ūd al-Şawābī 33
 Maşyāf 249
 Maṭirābād 15
 Maymūn ibn Badr al-Lamtūnī 91
 Maymūn ibn Ḥamdūn 42
 Mayyāfāriqīn 306, 307, 386
 Māyū al-Burṣānī (Maio of Bari) 64
 Mazandaran 93
 Mazandaran, Shāh of 227
 Mecca 35, 129–30, 135
 disturbances at 244–45
 Medina 101, 151–52, 159, 276
 Miftāḥ ibn ‘Amr 154–55
 Minā 136, 151
 Mlech son of Leon 210–11
 moon's eclipses 262
 Mosul 112, 118, 168, 192–94, 246,
 285–87, 287, 304–6, 308–9, 310
 Zankī's death and 7, 8, 84, 111
 Mount Zaghwān 106
 al-Mu'ammar ibn ‘Abd al-Wāhid ibn Rājā'
 182
 Mu'ammar ibn Rushayd 13, 14
 al-Mu'ayyad Ay-Aba (lord of Nishapur) 58,
 61, 90, 92–93, 93–94, 96, 97–98,
 99–100, 115–16, 118, 124, 125,
 128–29, 132–33, 139–40, 154,
 156–57, 159, 203, 207, 208, 227
 Mu'ayyad al-Dawla Usāma ibn Munqidh
 al-Kinānī 67, 87, 88, 134
 Mu'ayyad ibn Ḥusayn al-Muwaffaqī 98,
 99, 100
 al-Mu'ayyad al-Muwaffaqi al-Shāfi'i 100
 al-Mu'ayyad al-Ulūsī 44
 Muhadhdhib al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh ibn As'ad
 al-Mawṣilī 312
 Muhalhil ibn Abī'l-'Askar, Emir 82
 Muḥammad al-Harawī, Imam 109
 Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ibn
 Muḥammad ibn Thābit, Abū Bakr
 al-Khujandī 94
 Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Qumāj 58
 Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Jabbār
 259
 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥamza al-Aqsāsī
 269
 Muḥammad ibn Bakhtiyār 54, 298
 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī 25,
 132
 Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il 397
 Muḥammad ibn Lājīn 318
 Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd ibn Muḥammad
 ibn Malikshāh 23, 41, 45, 69–70,
 77–78, 82–84, 100–1, 110, 112
 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, Shaykh 59,
 61
 Muḥammad ibn Rushayd 13, 14, 18, 76
 Muḥammad ibn Ṣalīḥ 38
 Muḥammad ibn Sa'd al-Baghdādī 160
 Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Burhān al-Dīn
 ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Māza 153
 Muḥammad ibn Unur 72, 111, 155
 Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā, Shāfi'i lawyer 59,
 74
 Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Alī ibn
 Muslim, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zabīdī
 119
 Muḥammad al-Mārishkī 59
 Muhriz ibn Ziyād 63
 Muhyī al-Dīn Abū Ḥāmid 296
 Muhyī al-Dīn ibn al-Zakī 294, 334
 Mu'īn al-Dīn Unur 21, 22, 23, 33, 150
 Mu'izz al-Dīn Qayṣar Shāh ibn Qılıç Arslān
 395, 403, 404
 Mu'izz al-Dīn Sanjar Shāh ibn Ghāzī ibn
 Mawdūd 271, 296, 304, 379, 384–85
 Mujāhid al-Dīn Qāymāz 242, 246, 250,
 258, 269, 271, 279, 284, 287, 296–97,
 299, 305, 308, 309, 310, 381
 Mujāhid al-Dīn Bahrūz 176
 Mujīr al-Dīn Abaq ibn Būrī ibn Ṭughtakīn
 21, 71, 72
 Mujīr al-Dīn Ṭāshtakīn 340
 Mukarram ibn Bakhtiyār 298
 Mukaththir, Emir of Mecca 244
 Multan 54
 Munaytira 161
 al-Muntafiq 142, 398
 al-Muqaddam ‘Abd al- Malik 28
 al-Muqanna' 57
 al-Muqtafī li-Amr Allāh, Caliph 16, 23, 32,
 41, 44, 65, 69, 73, 74, 77, 94, 95, 111,
 113, 114, 151
 Murīd al-Dīn ibn Nisān 85
 al-Muṣṭaḍī bi-Amr Allāh, Caliph 196, 201,
 210–11, 245
 al-Muṣṭanjid bi-Allāh Yūsuf, Caliph 16,
 113–15, 118, 125, 134–35, 142, 159,

- 166, 169, 181, 190–92, 193, 195, 196, 198, 267
 al-Mustarshid bi-Allāh, Caliph 33, 131
 al-Mustaṣhir bi-Allāh 113, 195
 Mu’ta, battle of 367
 Mu’tamin al-Khilāfa 179, 180
 al-Mutanabbī 265
 Muẓaffar al-Dīn Kūkburī ibn Zayn al-Dīn 304, 305, 319, 365, 381, 386
 al-Muẓaffar ibn Ardashīr 41
 Muẓaffar ibn Hammād ibn Abīl-Khayr 85
 Nablus 326, 333
 al-Nahrawan 30
 Najm al-Dīn Abūl-Barakāt Muḥammad ibn al-Muwaffaq al-Khabūshānī (‘the Scholar Emir’) 196
 Najm al-Dīn Alpī ibn Timurtāsh 55, 147
 Najm al-Dīn Ayyūb ibn Shādī 11, 110, 175–76, 199–200, 214
 Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī 182
 Narjis 190
 Nasā 156
 al-Nashw ibn Nafādha 266
 al-Nāṣīḥ ibn al-‘Amīd 309
 Naṣīr al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn Abī Naṣr Muḥammad 159
 Naṣīr al-Dīn, brother of Shāwar 145
 Naṣīr al-Dīn Kabak 271
 Naṣīr al-Dīn Mankūbars 348
 Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar 399, 400
 Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Shīrkūh (Saladin’s cousin) 237, 258, 262, 285, 286, 306, 309
 al-Nāṣīr li-Dīn Allāh Abūl-‘Abbas Aḥmad, Caliph 227, 267, 268, 287, 296, 311, 357, 370, 382, 397
 Naṣr ibn ‘Abbās ibn Abīl-Futūḥ 62, 67
 Naṣr ibn Fityān ibn Maṭar 343
 Naṣr ibn Manṣūr ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abūl-Qāsim al-Ḥarrānī 102
 Naṣr ibn al-Mustaṣhir, Emir 195
 Nazār, Emir 33, 35
 Nazareth 326
 Nihāwand 212
 Niksār 403, 404
 Nishapur 57, 59–60, 60, 61, 74, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99–100, 111, 115, 124, 125, 126, 130, 132, 136, 140, 209
 Nisibis 285, 288
 Niżām al-Dīn Alpqush 302
 Niżām al-Mulk Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥasan ibn Tāhir 60
 Niżāmiyya Madrasa 54, 118, 137, 170, 215, 268, 312, 342, 371
 Nubia 209–10
 Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Qilij Arslān 403, 404
 Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Zankī, al-‘Ādil 27–29, 83–84, 118, 167, 266, 279
 Apamea castle captured 36
 Asad al-Dīn and 175–76
 Baalbek taken by 94
 character 222–23
 city walls and 87
 Damascus and 21–22, 30, 71–72, 73, 94
 death 221–23
 description 221–22
 earthquakes and 185
 Edessa and 8
 Egypt and 144–46, 147, 163–64, 165, 172–73
 Franks and 24–25, 31, 39, 45–46, 130, 141–42, 200, 209
 Ḥarim and 79–80, 110–11, 134, 146–48
 historian’s attitude to 4
 Joscelin the Frank and 39
 Kerak and 184, 214
 Mlech and 210
 Mosul and 192–94
 Munayṭira taken by 161
 Qal’at Ja’bar taken by 171
 Qilij Arslān and 157–58, 213
 Saladin and 178, 183, 196, 198–200, 214, 217, 221
 Shayzar castle taken by 87–89
 Sinjār and 28–29
 sources 3
 Tell Bāshir taken by 72–73
 al-‘Urayma 22–23
 Zankī’s death and 7, 8
 Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān ibn Dā’ūd, lord of Ḥisn Kayfā 167, 192, 271–72, 284, 285, 286, 291, 292, 300, 306–7, 358

- Odo of Saint-Amand 264
 Oghuz Turks vii, 48, 49, 56–61, 72, 74, 77, 79, 81, 90, 96–97, 99, 100, 115, 116, 117, 125, 126, 140–41, 150, 154, 204, 208
 Oxus river 201, 204, 206
- Pahlawān ibn Īldikiz 70, 121, 122, 168–69, 211, 212, 237, 268, 299, 306, 315
 Palestine 3
 Peshawar 49, 50, 405
 Philip II, king of France 386, 388, 397
 Philip of Mahdiyya 63–64
 pilgrim caravan 35
 pilgrims, attacks on 318, 340
- al-Qādī al-Fāḍil 219–20, 232, 294, 305, 344, 357
 Qāsim ibn Fulayta, Emir of Mecca 129–30
 Qāymāz al-‘Amīdī 109
 Qāymāz al-Arjuwānī 33, 35, 119
 Qāymāz al-Ḥamīdī 190
 Qāymāz al-Ḥarrānī 225
 Qāymāz al-Najmī 319, 339, 344, 356
 Qāymāz al-Sultānī 95
 Qabès 311
 Qadas, Lake of 141
 Qal’at Ja’bar 171
 Qalūnaya 398
 Qarāja al-Sāqī 176
 Qarakhanids vii, 57
 Qarakhitay viii, 2, 201
 Qarāqūsh, Emir of Tūghān Shāh 204
 Qarāqūsh, mamluke of Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar 211, 273, 310, 311, 313, 314
 Qarātakīn’s Meadow 13
 Qarluq Turks 57, 74, 81, 153
 Qasāmil 398
 Qaṣr ‘Isā 82
 Qayba 111
 Qayṣar, Emir 24, 128
 Qazwin 158–59
 Qilij Arslān ibn Mas‘ūd ibn Qilij Arslān, ‘Izz al-Dīn 157–58, 213, 228, 266–67, 271–72, 376, 395, 403–5
 Qiwām al-Dīn ibn Samāqā al-Is‘ardī 307
 Qizil Arslān ‘Uthmān ibn Īldikiz 122, 123, 237, 299, 315, 340, 394–95, 407
 Qujuq, Emir 41
- Qumāj al-Mustarshidī 167
 Qumāj, Emir 46, 56, 58
 Qūmis 139–40, 154
 Qūrij Canal 215, 227
 al-Qurṭubī, Abū Bakr Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘dūn ibn Tammām al-Azdī 202
 al-Qusayr 349
 Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak, mamluke of Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Sām 54, 406
 Quṭb al-Dīn Īlghāzī ibn Alpī ibn Timurtāsh ibn Īlghāzī ibn Artuq, lord of Mardin 270–30, 288, 289, 302
 Quṭb al-Dīn Malikshāh ibn Qilij Arslān, Prince 375, 395
 Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd ibn Zankī 16, 27, 28, 29, 77, 78, 82, 90, 111, 112, 147, 150, 152, 165, 166, 167, 168, 186–87, 191, 192, 227
 Quṭb al-Dīn al-Nīshābūrī 223
 Quṭb al-Dīn Qāymāz al-Muqtafawi 190, 201, 227, 238–39
 Quṭb al-Dīn Yīnāl ibn Ḥassān al-Manbijī 167, 242–43, 285
 Qutlugh īnānj ibn Pahlawān ibn Īldikiz 407
 Quwaydān, Emir 78, 100
- Ra'bān fortress 266, 271
 Rađī al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī 268
 Rađī al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ḥaydara al-Raḥbī 221–22
 al-Raḥba 29, 128, 176, 303, 309
 Ra’īs ibn al-Khashshāb 231
 Ramla 194, 253–54, 330, 390, 392, 393, 394
 al-Raqīm 214
 Raqqa 7, 111, 166, 192, 225, 243, 279
 Ra’s al-Mā’ 173, 318
 Rāykān 97
 Raymond, Count, lord of Tripoli 234, 315, 316, 319–20, 321, 322, 324, 328, 353–54
 Raymond of Poitiers, lord of Antioch 31
 Rayy 10, 24, 30, 61–62, 84, 111, 181
 Red Sea 289–90
 Reynald, lord of Sidon 360, 361
 Reynald, Prince, lord of Kerak 276, 289, 316–17, 318, 323–24
 Richard I, king of England 387, 390, 392, 394, 396, 397, 398, 401–2

- Roger des Moulins 319
 Roger the Frank, King of Sicily 14, 18, 20,
 32, 62–63, 64, 76
 Rukn al-Dīn Sulaymān ibn Qilij Arslān
 403, 404
 Rushayd 13
 Rustum ibn ‘Alī ibn Shahriyār, Shāh of
 Mazandaran 91–92, 93, 109–10,
 116–17, 139, 154, 156
 Rūyīn Diz castle 237
 Ruzzīk family 219
- Sābiq al-Dīn al-Qazwīnī 154
 Sābiq al-Dīn ‘Uthmān ibn al-Dāya, Emir
 346
 Sabuktakīn, house of 25
 end of dynasty 50–51
 Sābzawār 97
 Sa’d al-Dīn ibn Mu’īn al-Dīn Unur 287–88
 Sa’d Allāh ibn Yaḥyā, Almohad
 commander 63
 Ḡadaqa ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥaddād 258
 Ḡadaqa ibn Wazīr, Sufi preacher 137
 Ṣadr al-Dīn, Cadi of Marāgha 237
 Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Laṭīf ibn al-Khujandī
 158
 Ṣadr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Ismā‘īl,
 Chief Shaykh 11, 227, 268, 287, 296,
 303
 Ṣadr al-Dīn Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Sa’d al-Ṣūfī,
 Chief Shaykh 11
 Safed 268, 338, 344, 355
 Ṣaffūriyya 326, 365
 Ṣafī al-Dīn ibn Qābīd 395
 Ṣafīthā 165, 200, 344
al-Ṣaḥīḥ, al-Bukhārī’s ḥadīth collection
 102
 Ṣahyūn castle 347–48
 Saladin (Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb):
 Abū Shāma’s view 4
 Acre and 324–25, 337, 338, 364–66,
 372, 376, 379, 409
 Aleppo and 233–34, 236, 243–44,
 293–95, 298
 alliance of enemies and 288–89
 Āmid and 291–92
 Antioch and 353–54
 Asad al-Dīn and 176–77
 Ascalon and 329–30
 assassination attempted 243
 assassination plot against 218–21
 Ayla conquered 194
 ‘Ayntāb taken by 292, 295
 Baalbek and 234–35, 260–61
 Baghrās and 352
 Bānyās fort and 265–66
 Barziyya and 349–52
 birth 408
 Cairo and 252
 Caliph al-Āḍid and 196–97
 character 314, 401, 408–9
 Damascus and 231–32, 235, 281, 354,
 402, 408
 Darbsāk and 352
 death 408
 Egypt and 164, 165, 174, 176–79,
 183–84, 194, 196–98, 229–30, 249,
 281
 family’s holdings reorganised 314–15
 Hārim and 295
 Hātṭīn and 322–24
 Hama and 233, 236, 237
 Harrān and 304, 308–9
 historians’ attitude to 4
 Homs and 233–34
 Ibn al-Athīr’s attitude towards 4
 illnesses 308, 309, 314, 369, 379
 Ismā‘īlis 249
 ‘Izz al-Dīn Mas‘ūd and 279, 308–9
 Jabala and 345–46
 Jaffa and 400–1
 Jazīra lands and 284–85
 Jerusalem and 330–35, 393–94, 396,
 398, 402
 Jordan depression and 283
 Kerak and 30–1, 297–98, 318–19, 344,
 354
 al-Malik al-Ṣāliḥ and 232, 233, 235, 236
 Marj ‘Uyūn battle 264, 265
 Mayyāfāriqīn and 306, 307–8
 Mosul and 285–87, 304–6, 308
 Nūr al-Dīn and 178, 183, 196, 198–200,
 214, 217, 221
 Qilij Arslān and 266, 271–72
 Quṭb al-Dīn Īlghāzī and 279
 Ramla and 253–54
 Roupen III invaded by 272–73
 Ṣahyūn and 347–48

- Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī and 235–36, 241–42
 Shaqīf Arnūn and 360–61
 Shāwar and 175
 Sinjār and 287–88
 sources on 3
 Syria 271, 278, 281, 284
 Tell Khālid taken by 292, 295
 Tiberias and 320–21, 324
 Tyre and 4, 335–37
 Yemen and 277
 Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Yāghisīyānī 7, 8
 Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Sunqur, Emir 154
 al-Salār, al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm al-‘Alawī 25
 Salārkurd, Emir 15
 Salé 133, 134
 al-Ṣāliḥ Ismā‘īl ibn Nūr al-Dīn 223–24, 226, 231–33, 235–36, 242–44, 255–56, 266, 271, 277–78, 295
 al-Ṣāliḥ Ṭalā‘ī ibn Ruzzīk, vizier 68–69, 112–13, 126–28, 138, 157–58
 Saljuq sultanate vii, 1, 43, 47, 70, 179
 Saljūqa Khātūn, daughter of Qılıç Arslān 358
 Saljūqshāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Arslān Shāh, ruler of Kerman 80
 Ṣaltuq ibn ‘Alī, lord of Erzerum 66, 130
 Sām ibn al-Ḥusayn 25
 Samanids 178
 Samarqand 153
 Ṣanhāja 104
 Sanja 48
 Sanjar ibn Malikshāh, Sultan 11, 24, 30, 46–48, 52, 56–57, 58–59, 73, 77, 79, 80–81, 90–91, 93, 99, 125
 Sanjar Shāh ibn Ṭughān Shāh ibn al-Mu’ayyad 204, 205
 Saqmas ibn Qaymāz al-Ḥarāmī 84
 Sarafand 327
 Sarakhs 96, 98, 140, 157, 204, 208
 Ṣārim al-Dīn Qutlugh-Aba 277
 Sarkhak, mamluke of Nūr al-Dīn Maḥmūd 256, 295
 Sarmīniyya 349
 Sarsut 341
 Sarūj 171, 225, 294
 Sawād 215, 216
 Sayf al-Dawla Mubārak ibn Kāmil ibn Munqidh al-Kinānī 217, 218, 276
 Sayf al-Dīn Abū Bakr ibn al-Salār 250
 Sayf al-Dīn Baktimur 288, 306, 386
 Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Quṭb al-Dīn Mawdūd 28, 186–87, 192, 193, 224–25, 226, 231, 235–36, 241–42, 242–43, 244, 258, 270–71
 Sayf al-Dīn Ghāzī ibn Zankī, lord of Mosul 7–8, 16, 21–22, 23, 27, 28, 47, 89, 176
 Sayf al-Dīn Iyāzkūsh 390
 Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghūrī 124, 140–41
 Sayf al-Dīn Tankiz, mamluke 154, 157
 Sayf al-Dīn Yāzkūj 297
 Sayf al-Islām Ṭughtakin (Saladin’s brother) 233, 282
 Sebastea 326
 Sétif 62, 63
 Seville 9, 212
 Sfax 76, 77, 105
 Shaddād, Fakhr al-Dīn, Emir of Ānī 74
 Shādyākh 125–26, 132
 Shāfi‘īs 98, 99, 194, 216, 395
 Shāh Arman (Sukmān ibn Ibrāhīm al-Quṭbī) 122, 129–30, 135, 287–89, 302, 306–7, 386
 Shāh Bānwār 130
 Shahrazūr 7, 78, 168, 308
 Shahristan 128–29
 Shams al-Dawla Tūrānshāh (Saladin’s brother) 180, 195, 209–10, 217–18, 246, 250, 254, 260, 261, 268, 274, 277
 Shams al-Dīn Abū'l-Faṭḥ Aḥmad ibn Naṣr 155
 Shams al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn al-Dāya 189, 224, 225
 Shantarīn 299
 Shaqīf Arnūn 360–61
 Shaqīf Tīrūn 326
 Sharaf al-Dīn Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad ibn al-Baladī 166, 169
 Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Abī'l-Qāsim Manṣūr ibn Abī Sa‘d al-Sā‘idī 111
 Sharaf al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Ṭirād al-Zaynabī, vizier 11
 Sharaf al-Dīn Amīr Amīrān Hindaw 287
 Sharaf al-Dīn Buzghush, lord of Shaqīf 164

- Sharaf al-Dīn Gird-Bāzū the Eunuch 100, 121
 Sharaf al-Dīn Yūsuf al-Dimashkī 137
 Shātān castle 131
 Shāwar, Fatimid vizier 138, 144, 145, 163, 165, 172–75
 Shāwar family 219
 Shawbak 198–99, 281, 318
 Shayzar 36, 87, 134, 185, 217, 223, 346, 376
 Shihāb al-Dīn [Ilyās ibn Īlghāzī] the Artuqid 279–80
 Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ḥamidī al-Harawī 160
 Shihāb al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Tekesh al-Ḥārimī 199, 237, 249, 254–55
 Shihāb al-Dīn Mālik ibn ‘Alī ibn Mālik al-‘Uqaylī 171
 Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Buzān, lord of Shahrazūr 250
 Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ilyās 279
 Shihāb al-Dīn (Mu’izz al-Dīn) Muḥammad ibn Sām (Ghurid) 48, 49–50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 205, 206, 207, 340, 405, 406
 Shi’ites 109, 142, 215
 Shimīrum 123
 Shirkūh *see* Asad al-Dīn Shirkūh
 al-Shughr castle 348
 Shuhda *al-Kātiba* 73, 263
 Shujā’ (Hanāfi lawyer) 137
 Shumla (Aydughdī) the Turkoman, lord of Khuzistan 45, 74, 84, 95–96, 100, 101, 110, 124, 166–67, 180–81, 237
 Sicily 16, 18, 42, 64, 76, 77, 106, 219, 229
 Sidon 130, 327–28, 361, 364, 379
 Sijistan 155, 206, 207
 Silves 381–82
 Sinān, head of Syrian Ismā’īlīs 234, 249, 396
 Sinjār 7, 28–29, 192, 232, 279, 287
 Sivas 213, 395, 403, 404
 Sūrī ibn Ḥusayn (Ghurid) 25–26
 Sudan 29
 Sulaymān ibn Jandār 295, 314
 Sulaymān ibn Qutlumush 118
 Sulaymān Shāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh, Prince 11, 59, 60, 61, 77–79, 110, 112, 118, 120–21
 Sultān ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Muqallad 87, 88, 89
 Sultān Shāh Maḥmūd ibn Īl Arslān ibn Atsiz 203–9, 382
 Sultan’s Hill 241
 Sumaysāt castle 279
 Sunnis 215
 Sunqur al-‘Azīzī 93–94
 Sunqur al-Hamadhānī 95, 100, 101, 109, 134–35
 sun’s eclipses 245, 262
 Suqmān, Quṭb al-Dīn (son of Nur al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Qarā Arslān) 307
 Susa 76
 Syria:
 earthquakes in 87, 185–86
 Franks and 146, 183, 219
 homing pigeons 201
 sources for 3
 see also under Saladin (Şalāḥ al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Ayyūb)
 Tabarak 124
 Tabarinda 341
 Tabaristān 91–92, 93
 Tabas 85
 Tabriz 237
 Tāhir ibn Fakhr al-Mulk ibn Niẓām al-Mulk, vizier 59, 60
 Ta’izz castle 218
 Tāj al-Dīn Abū Tāhir Yahyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Shahrazūrī 75
 Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī (Saladin’s brother) 281, 286, 294–95
 Takrit 11, 24, 44, 176, 370, 408
 siege of 65, 69
 al-Ta’kur castle 218
 Tālib fortress 131
 Tamghāj Khān ibn Muḥammad 74
 Taqī al-Dīn ‘Umar (Saladin’s nephew) 194, 199, 211, 253, 262, 266, 267, 278, 288, 298, 310, 312–14, 322, 326, 327, 346, 350, 360, 365, 366, 367, 379, 384–85, 385–86, 399
 Tarsus 210
 Tashtakīn al-Mustanjidi, Emir of the Pilgrimage 195, 244, 252, 340, 406
 Tatar the Chamberlain 10, 23
 Ta’ūs (Peacock) 114, 190
 Tayy 138
 Tell Bāshir 8

- Tell Kaysān 372
 Tell Khālid 292, 295
 Tell Ya‘far 28
 Templars 319, 320, 323, 324, 325, 329, 334, 345, 352, 356, 368, 389, 392
 Thiqat al-Dawla Abū'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Duwaynī 73
 Tiberias 149, 209, 265, 266, 268, 320–21, 324, 368
 Saladin conquers 321
 Tiberias, Lady of, Countess *see* Eschiva of Bures
 Tibnīn 326, 327
 Tigris 83, 108, 176, 192, 214–15, 226
 Tinnis 65
 Tirmidh 81, 99
 Tokat 403
 Toledo 382
 Transoxania 74, 153, 201, 204
 Tripoli 22, 76, 87, 105, 141, 200, 211, 354, 376
 Tripoli, Count lord of 147
 Tūba ibn al-'Uqaylī 159
 Ṭughān Shāh Abū Bakr ibn al-Mu'ayyad 203, 204, 208–9
 Ṭughril ibn Arslān ibn Ṭughril ibn Muḥammad ibn Malikshāh 256, 315, 340, 357, 394, 407
 Ṭughril ibn Qāwurt 188
 Ṭughril Takīn 154
 Ṭukhāristān 57, 58
 Ṭūmān al-Yārūqī 293
 Tunāmish, 'Alā' al-Dīn, brother of Emir Yazdan 190, 215, 228, 238–39, 359
 Tunis 3, 103–4, 310, 311
 Tunisia *see* Ifrīqiya
 Ṭuraythīt 37, 38, 41, 116
 Turkān Shāh 188
 Turkomans 69, 70, 74, 101, 130, 135, 155, 237, 252, 310
 Turks 56, 57, 58, 93, 150, 211, 312
 Turshuk 65, 69, 70, 109, 111, 120
 al-Turunṭā'ī 30
 Ṭūs 59, 61, 93, 97, 125, 208
 Tyre 326, 328–29, 337, 355, 356
 Franks at 360, 361, 362, 364, 380, 391
 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūnus 342
 'Umar al-Khwārizmī 155
 'Umar al-Mallā' 193
 'Umar al-Marghanī 208
 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Azīz 222
 'Umar ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Furrayānī 76, 77
 'Umar ibn 'Alī Yāgh 181
 'Umar ibn Ḥamza al-Nasawī 97
 'Umāra ibn Abī'l-Ḥasan al-Yamanī 127, 217, 219, 220–21
 'Umayra, Emir 397
 Umm 'Abbās 62
 Uplands 24, 78, 101, 112
 al-'Uqayma 187, 188
 'Urāyma 165, 200, 344
 Usāma, Emir 379, 386
 Usāma ibn Munqidh 62, 69
 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān 257
 Uwāna 83
 al-'Uwayris, Cadi 219
 Valley of the Women 107
 Veiled Ones *see* Almoravids
 Wajīh al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd 208
 Wāsiṭ 70, 82, 94, 100, 166, 215
 Waskara Khoy 132
 al-Wa'wā' al-Ḥalabī 85
 William the Frank, king of Sicily 64, 76–77, 105, 106
 Yaghī Arslān ibn Dānishmand 155, 157
 Yaghmur Khān ibn Ūdak 115, 116–17
 Yaḥmūr 344
 Yaḥyā al-Ghassānī 75
 Yaḥyā ibn al-'Azīz ibn Hammād 20, 30, 42
 Yaḥyā ibn Salāma ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad, Abū'l-Faḍl al-Ḥaskafī 102
 Ya'qūb al-Ḥalabī 387
 Ya'qūb the Secretary 54
 Yāsir, ruler of Aden 218
yazak 2
 Yazdan ibn Qumāj 142–43, 190
 Yazir Turks 115, 117
 Yāzkush, Emir 243
 Yemen 152, 222, 246, 274, 276, 277
 Yubnā 330
 Yumn, a eunuch 234–35
 Yurunqush al-Falakī 154
 Yūsuf al-Dimashqī 38, 118, 166, 170

- Yūsuf ibn Mālik 106–7
Yūsuf the freedman 13, 14
- Zabīd 217, 218, 282, 283
al-Za‘farān 225
al-Zāfir bi-[Amr] Allāh Abū al-Manṣūr
 Ismā‘il 29, 62, 64, 67
al-Zāfir Khiḍr (Saladin’s son) 379
Zahīr al-Dīn ibn al-Attār 102, 238, 254,
 267–68
al-Zāhir Ghāzī (Saladin’s son) 297, 347,
 349, 379
Zāhir al-Shahhāmī 41
Za‘im al-Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Ja‘far 16
Zankī, Atabeg 8, 43, 176
 death 7, 11, 15, 16, 68, 89
- Zankī ibn ‘Alī ibn Khalīfa al-Shaybānī
 57–58, 150
Zankī ibn Dakalā 123, 124, 180
Zankī al-Jāndār (the Lifeguard) 10, 45
Zankids 1, 4
Zawīla 76, 77, 103
Zawzān 310
Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Najā the Preacher 219
Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī Kūchuk ibn Baktakīn 7, 8,
 27, 28, 66, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 111,
 112, 118, 147, 148, 168
Zayn al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī
 299, 304, 374, 380–81
Zīrī ibn Manād 19
Zirid house 3, 19
Zughb 35